arXiv:1209.2148v2 [math-ph] 18 Sep 2012

ALGEBRAIC STRUCTURE OF CLASSICAL FIELD THEORY I: KINEMATICS AND LINEARIZED DYNAMICS FOR REAL SCALAR FIELDS

ROMEO BRUNETTI, KLAUS FREDENHAGEN, AND PEDRO LAURIDSEN RIBEIRO

Abstract. We describe the elements of a novel structural approach to classical field theory, inspired by recent developments in perturbative algebraic quantum field theory. This approach is local and functorial, being characterized by a combination of geometric, analytic and algebraic elements which (1) make it closer to quantum field theory, (2) allow for a rigorous analytic refinement of many computational formulae from the functional formulation of classical field theory and (3) provide a new pathway towards understanding dynamics. Particular attention will be paid to aspects related to nonlinear hyperbolic partial differential equations and the functorial structure underlying our approach.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: Primary 70S05, 70S20; Secondary 17B63, 35L10, 35L72, 58C15

Keywords: relativistic classical field theory, algebraic approach, observables, hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange equations, Nash-Moser-Hörmander theorem

Contents

1. Introduction 2
2. Kinematics 5
  2.1. Preliminaries 5
  2.2. Topology and geometry of the space of field configurations 8
  2.3. Functionals as observables 12
3. Off-shell linearized dynamics 20
  3.1. Preliminaries. Generalized Lagrangians and the Euler-Lagrange derivative 21
  3.2. Normally hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange operators. Infinitesimal solvability and the Peierls bracket 24
4. First structural results 38
5. Final considerations 45
Acknowledgements 45
Appendix A. A short review of differential calculus on locally convex topological vector spaces 46
References 50

Date: September 19, 2012.

1. Introduction

This is the first of a series of three papers devoted to the algebraic analysis of classical field theories in the general relativistic Lagrangian setting.

The longstanding problem of finding a coherent and systematic mathematical structure for classical field theories has been addressed in various ways. Among them, we quote two main lines of investigation: one based on (multi)symplectic geometry [18, 30, 35, 46], seeking a covariant generalization of Hamiltonian mechanics and that goes back to de Donder and Weyl; and the other based on the so-called formal theory of systems of partial differential equations [2, 50, 67, 72, 73], seeking a higher-order generalization of S. Lie's and É. Cartan's geometric approach to the analysis of integrability and symmetries of such systems. Both approaches have several points of contact and lead to a highly developed framework for the calculus of variations. As far as *relativistic* field theories are concerned, however, the solution spaces of the dynamics generated by the variational principle are essentially taken for granted and their properties are seldom studied in depth, a noteworthy exception being the approach of Christodoulou [19].

Physicists, on the other hand, are keen on formal functional methods [21, 23], tailored to the needs of (path-integral-based) quantum field theory, which are essentially a heuristic infinite-dimensional generalization of Lagrangian mechanics. To a certain extent, it is possible to make these latter methods rigorous (see for instance [1, 9]). However, in these approaches the field configuration spaces are usually modeled on Banach spaces, which provide a simple differential calculus but entail some physically undesirable restrictions on the allowed space-times and on the regularity of the allowed field configurations. Moreover, these approaches also tend to deemphasize aspects related to covariance and locality, which are central in any relativistic field theory since then Euler-Lagrange equations of motion are *differential* (expressing locality of the underlying variational principle) and *hyperbolic* (expressing finiteness of the propagation speed of dynamical effects).

Even more importantly, a pivotal aspect that none of the above approaches has addressed in a satisfactory manner is the characterization of *local observables*, as opposed to spaces of field configurations. This remark is the starting point of our present investigation. Namely, we contend that if one wants to study the structure of local observables in a *model-independent* fashion, one is inevitably led to an *algebraic* viewpoint. This is a deep lesson learned from quantum field theory [36], which however does not seem to have echoed back to classical field theory until quite recently, the only exception to our knowledge being [53]. This state of things has started to change due to the recent developments in perturbative algebraic quantum field theory [11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 27, 28]. This is a research program aiming at a mathematically precise understanding of perturbative quantum field theory and renormalization from an algebraic viewpoint – to wit, renormalized perturbative quantum field theory can be seen as a formal deformation of classical field theory, in a rather precise sense [11, 12, 27].

The key upshot of this program, which motivated the present work, is that it singles out the relevant class of observables for classical field theory from a few, physically reasonable requirements which, at the quantum level, are needed to restrict the class of allowed counterterms in renormalization. This serves as a starting point for a new, algebraic framework for classical (relativistic) field theory in its own right, which emphasizes from the very beginning the role of local observables and how they are affected by the dynamics. Presenting this framework in full detail is the objective of this series of papers. Let us now give an overview of its results.

As we shall see, local observables are represented by certain classes of functionals over the space of smooth field configurations. More precisely, the kinematical requirements on functionals in order to qualify as local observables lead, among other things, to a surprisingly simple structure for the local algebras they generate – for instance, these algebras, when suitably topologized, turn out to be *nuclear*, opening the way to a seamless composition of classical subsystems by means of tensor products [14].

A cornerstone of our framework concerns the treatment of *dynamics*, which spans the first two papers of this series. We do not impose *a priori* any equation of motion whatsoever – that is, we employ an *off-shell* viewpoint. Our analysis of the full nonlinear dynamics is based on a *semi-global solvability* result for second-order, quasi-linear hyperbolic partial differential operators $P : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, to be stated in detail and proved in the second paper of this series. More precisely, therein we prove, for a suitably large family of compact regions K of the space-time manifold $\mathscr{M}$, that the equation

$$P(\varphi_0 + \varphi) = P(\varphi_0) + f$$

has a smooth solution φ in K for any $\varphi_0, f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(K)$, f sufficiently small. Moreover, if we prescribe the Cauchy data for φ on a suitable Cauchy hypersurface crossing K, this solution must be unique. This result, which we call the Main Dynamical Theorem, is proved by combining a simple refinement (due to Klainerman [47]) of classical energy estimates for second-order linear hyperbolic partial differential operators with a variant of the Nash-Moser-Hörmander inverse function theorem. Our proof is therefore quite close to the strategy proposed by Bryant, Griffiths and Yang [17] for addressing local solvability of first-order quasi-linear symmetric hyperbolic systems arising from low-dimensional isometric embedding problems, but it contains several improvements – our argument is completely geometric, and we need less restrictive assumptions in order to apply our choice of inverse function theorem. Since we are only concerned with the effect of replacing φ_0 with $\varphi_0+\varphi$ on local observables, the fact that the Main Dynamical Theorem only holds on regions K as above is of little consequence to us. The Main Dynamical Theorem leads effortlessly to the construction of maps on smooth field configurations that intertwine perturbed and unperturbed Euler-Lagrange operators, called *Møller maps*.

As a prelude to this result, we show in the present paper that, on an infinitesimal level, the dynamics is implemented algebraically on local observables by means of a Poisson structure associated to certain Lagrangians, given in covariant form by the Peierls bracket [23, 30, 56, 63]. This bracket is a covariant generalization of the canonical Poisson bracket [9, 75], and has an unambiguous off-shell extension which however becomes degenerate. We shall deepen its analysis in the second paper of the series, with the aid of the Møller maps. It turns out that they are canonical transformations from unperturbed into perturbed Poisson structures, and a direct corollary of the Main Dynamical Theorem is an infinite-dimensional version of the

Darboux-Weinstein theorem for regular Poisson manifolds [71]: the Peierls bracket can be locally linearized by a suitable change of coordinates in field configuration space, and induces a (weak) symplectic structure on each level set of the restriction of the Euler-Lagrange operator to each compact region K of the space-time manifold on which the Main Dynamical Theorem holds. As a consequence, the degeneracy of the Peierls bracket is completely characterized by the local observables that vanish on solutions of the corresponding equations of motion, which constitute a Poisson ideal. Therefore, at the level of observables, imposing equations of motion amounts to taking a quotient of Poisson algebras, very much in the spirit of algebraic geometry. Finally, our Poisson algebras satisfy the following "time slice" property: any observable localized in a certain globally hyperbolic region of space-time equals one localized in an arbitrarily small open neighborhood of a Cauchy hypersurface of this region, up to a functional that vanishes on all solutions of the Euler-Lagrange equations. This displays at the algebraic level the one-to-one correspondence between solutions and initial data, as well as the relation of our framework to canonical approaches [1, 9, 75].

In the third paper of this series, we shall address another important aspect of our approach, i.e. its *functorial behavior* with respect to (isometric) embeddings of space-time regions, in the spirit of the so-called *principle of local covariance* [14, 16]. There is, however, a need to localize functionals in subsets *of field configuration spaces* over each space-time as well, which is forced upon us by the dynamics. In order to perform this task in a way which is coherent with the principle of local covariance, we need to refine the latter. This is done in two steps. Firstly, we show that the category of space-times itself can be seen as a kind of a topological space – more precisely, we prove that each object of this category admits a notion of a covering by other objects "up to embeddings". Such categories, called *sites* by its discoverer A. Grothendieck, play an important role in his formulation of algebraic geometry, for they constitute the natural abstract arena for *sheaves*. Indeed, our second step consists in proving that a collection of G_δ sets of field configurations over the elements of a covering of a certain space-time can be glued together in a unique way to form a G_δ set over this space-time, provided that certain compatibility conditions, called *descent conditions*, are satisfied. This shows that the collections of G_δ sets of field configurations over each space-time define a sheaf over the latter's category. The sheaf data can be conveniently reorganized into a kind of category which resembles a category of fiber bundles, called a *stack*, which keeps track of both kinds of localization simultaneously [74].

It is on such a category, rather than just the category of space-times, that we define field theories as covariant functors and local, covariant functionals (called *natural Lagrangians*) as natural transformations. Finally, we show that a natural Lagrangian defined on a G_δ set of field configurations over a certain space-time is completely determined, in a precise sense, by specifying it on a collection of descent-compatible G_δ sets over the elements of a covering. The same applies, of course, to every object locally derived from the natural Lagrangian alone, such as Euler-Lagrange operators and Peierls brackets. One concludes that *the field theory itself is completely determined by local data both at the level of space-times and of field configurations.* We call this property the *principle of space-time descent*, which is the desired refinement of the principle of local covariance. Finally, one can also cast the property of *(relativistic) causality* in functorial form, a task for which the aforementioned nuclearity of our local algebras becomes essential. The above considerations show that our approach to classical field theory can be seen as a rather non-trivial kind of *infinite dimensional* algebraic geometry, for which functional analytic aspects are bound to be critically important. In that respect, we remark that the kinematical aspects of our approach have several points of contact with the account of classical field theory employed in the book of Costello [20].

We conclude this introduction with a summary of the contents of the present paper. In Section 2, we discuss the bare minimum of kinematical concepts underlying our approach. For simplicity, we will consider only *real scalar* fields, since the case when the fields live in a general fiber bundle poses a different set of questions, which demand a separate treatment (we shall have more to say about this in the final Section 5). In Subsection 2.1, we present a fair amount of background on Lorentzian geometry, vector bundles and jets, which is also used in Subsection 2.2 to give an overview of the geometric and topological properties of the space of smooth field configurations. In Subsection 2.3 we introduce suitable classes of functionals over this space and discuss their support and localization properties, so as to be able to proceed to a detailed analysis of infinitesimal (i.e. linearized) dynamics in Section 3; the full nonlinear dynamics is to be analyzed in the second paper of this series. Euler-Lagrange equations are obtained from a class of local functionals parametrized by smooth, compactly supported functions f specifying the localization of these functionals in space-time. Such functionals are called *generalized Lagrangians*, examples of which are provided by integrals of Lagrangian densities multiplied by f over the space-time manifold (Subsection 3.1). We are mainly interested in those generalized Lagrangians which lead to (normally) hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange operators, which are discussed in Subsection 3.2. Therein we also define the Peierls bracket associated with such operators, and study its properties in depth. This bracket is shown to yield a Lie bracket in the space of so-called *microcausal* functionals, which are distinguished by the singularity structure of their functional derivatives. A particular highlight of this development is perhaps the first fully fledged and rigorous proof of the Jacobi identity for the Peierls bracket in the literature (Corollary 3.2.17), parts of which having previously appeared or been sketched in [11, 27] (there is also an independent account of this proof in the unpublished Diploma thesis [42]). A thorough discussion of the topological and algebraic aspects of the *-algebras of microcausal functionals is carried out in Section 4, using the previous Sections as motivation. Therein we show that the Lie bracket provided by the Peierls bracket is in fact a Poisson bracket; another noteworthy result in this Section is that the (Poisson) *-algebras of microcausal functionals also bear a $\mathscr{C}^\infty$*-ring* structure [60], that is, they admit a sort of smooth functional calculus (Theorem 4.0.22), which leads to a number of interesting consequences. Section 5 concludes our work by presenting some future prospects and challenges. Appendix A recalls basic concepts of differential calculus on locally convex topological vector spaces.

2. KINEMATICS

2.1. **Preliminaries.** Given nonvoid sets $A, A_1, \ldots, A_m$, we denote by $\mathbb{1} = \mathbb{1}_A : A \to A$ the *identity map* $\mathbb{1}_A(a) = a$, and by $\mathrm{pr}_{j_1,\ldots,j_k} : A_1 \times \cdots \times A_m \to A_{j_1} \times \cdots \times A_{j_k}$ the *canonical* *projection* $\mathrm{pr}_{j_1,\ldots,j_k}(a_1,\ldots,a_m)=(a_{j_1},\ldots,a_{j_k})$, $1\leq j_1<j_2<\cdots<j_k\leq m$. If $k=1$, we say that pr_j is the *canonical projection onto the k-th factor*.

First of all, a small refresher on Lorentzian geometry to fix our notation and terminology. Let $(\mathscr{M},g)$ be a *space-time*, that is, an oriented d-dimensional Lorentzian manifold. The underlying manifold $\mathscr{M}$ (called the *space-time manifold*) is assumed to be smooth, Hausdorff, paracompact and second countable (in particular, $\mathscr{M}$ has at most a countable number of connected components). By a *region* of $\mathscr{M}$ (or of $(\mathscr{M},g)$) we mean any subset of $\mathscr{M}$ with nonvoid interior. The Lorentzian metric g on $T\mathscr{M}$ endows $\mathscr{M}$ with the volume element $\mathrm{d}\mu_g=\sqrt{|\det g|}\mathrm{d}x$, the Levi-Civita connection ∇, the lowering (resp. raising) musical isomorphisms $g^\flat:T\mathscr{M}\to T^*\mathscr{M}$ (resp. $g^\sharp:T\mathscr{M}\to T^*\mathscr{M}$) given by $g^\flat(X)\doteq g(X,\cdot)$ (resp. $g^\sharp(\xi)\doteq(g^\flat)^{-1}(\xi)$), and the inverse Lorentzian metric g^{-1} on $T^*\mathscr{M}$ given by $g^{-1}(\xi_1,\xi_2)\doteq\xi_1(g^\sharp(\xi_2))$. We occasionally write $g(T)$ (resp. $g^{-1}(\omega)$) with a single argument T (resp. ω), which is understood to be a contravariant (resp. covariant) tensor of rank two. We will use the chosen orientation to identify smooth densities with smooth d-forms. We adopt for g the signature convention that, for all $p\in\mathscr{M}$, the subspace of $T_p\mathscr{M}$ consisting of eigenvectors of $g(p)$ with *negative* eigenvalues is one-dimensional and therefore consists of *timelike* vectors. Recall that $X\in T_p\mathscr{M}$ is timelike (resp. null, causal, spacelike) if $g(X,X)<0$ (resp. $=0$, ≤ 0, >0) – hence, the subspace of $T_p\mathscr{M}$ consisting of (spacelike) eigenvectors of $g(p)$ with positive eigenvalues is $(d-1)$-dimensional. We always assume that $\mathscr{M}$ is *time-oriented*, that is, there is a global timelike vector field T on $\mathscr{M}$ – we then say that a causal $X\in T_p\mathscr{M}$ is future (resp. past) directed if $g(X,T)<0$ (resp. >0).

Recall as well that a (piecewise) smooth curve segment $\gamma:[0,1]\ni\lambda\to\gamma(\lambda)\in\mathscr{M}$ is said to be timelike (resp. null, causal, spacelike) if $g(\dot\gamma(\lambda),\dot\gamma(\lambda))<0$ (resp. $=0$, ≤ 0, >0) for all $\lambda\in[0,1]$ (such that γ is smooth at λ), and that a causal curve segment is said to be future (resp. past) directed if $g(\dot\gamma(\lambda),T)<0$ (resp. >0) for any $\lambda\in[0,1]$ as above and any future directed timelike $T\in T_{\gamma(\lambda)}\mathscr{M}$. This allows us to define the chronological (resp. causal) future / past $I^{+/-}(U,g)$ (resp. $J^{+/-}(U,g)$) of $U\subset\mathscr{M}$ as

$$\begin{aligned}I^{+/-}(U,g)\doteq\{p\in\mathscr{M}:\exists\gamma:[0,1]\to\mathscr{M}&\text{ piecewise smooth, future / past directed}\\ &\text{timelike such that }\gamma(0)\in U,\gamma(1)=p\}\ ,\\ J^{+/-}(U,g)\doteq\{p\in\mathscr{M}:\exists\gamma:[0,1]\to\mathscr{M}&\text{ piecewise smooth, future / past directed}\\ &\text{causal such that }\gamma(0)\in U,\gamma(1)=p\}\ .\end{aligned}$$

We also set $I^{+/-}(\{p\},g)\doteq I^{+/-}(p,g)$ (resp. $J^{+/-}(\{p\},g)\doteq J^{+/-}(p,g)$) for any $p\in\mathscr{M}$, and, given $U,V\subset\mathscr{M}$, we write $U\gg_g/\ll_g V$ (resp. $U\geq_g/\leq_g V$) whenever $U\subset I^{+/-}(V,g)$ (resp. $U\subset J^{+/-}(V,g)$). If $U=\{p\}$ (resp. $V=\{q\}$) for some $p,q\in\mathscr{M}$, we replace U (resp. V) by p (resp. q) in the above notation. Finally, we always assume that g is *globally hyperbolic*, that is, g is *causal* (which means that there is no causal $\gamma:[0,1]\to\mathscr{M}$ such that $\gamma(0)=\gamma(1)$) and given $p\leq_g q\in\mathscr{M}$, the set $J^+(p,g)\cap J^-(q,g)$ is *compact*. An useful, equivalent description of global hyperbolicity can be given as follows [5, 6, 7, 8]: there is a smooth, surjective function $\tau:\mathscr{M}\to\mathbb{R}$ such that $g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\tau)$ is a future directed timelike vector field and $\Sigma^\tau_t\doteq\tau^{-1}(t)$ is a *Cauchy hypersurface* for $\mathscr{M}$ at each $t\in\mathbb{R}$, that is, Σ^τ_t is a codimension-one, smooth and boundary-less submanifold of $\mathscr{M}$ such that any inextendible causal curve intersects Σ^τ_t exactly once. Such a

τ is called a *Cauchy time function* with respect to $(\mathscr{M},g)$. Moreover, if $(\mathscr{M},g)$ has a Cauchy hypersurface Σ, one can build a Cauchy time function τ such that $\tau^{-1}(0)=\Sigma$ [8] – in particular, $\mathscr{M}$ must then be diffeomorphic to $\mathbb{R}\times\Sigma\cong\mathbb{R}\times\Sigma^\tau_t$ for any $t\in\mathbb{R}$.

Occasionally, we will need to work with smooth sections of vector bundles over the space-time manifold $\mathscr{M}$ or over Cartesian powers thereof. Recall, for the sake of fixing nomenclature, that a (real) *vector bundle* of rank D over $\mathscr{M}$ is given by a smooth surjective submersion $\pi:\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M}$ from the *total space* $\mathscr{E}$ to the *base* $\mathscr{M}$, called the *projection map*, such that there is an open covering $\{U_j\}_{j\in J}$ of $\mathscr{M}$ and for each $j\in J$ a smooth diffeomorphism $\psi_j:\pi^{-1}(U_j)\to U_j\times\mathbb{R}^D$ (called a *local trivialization* over U_j) such that $\psi_k\circ\psi_j^{-1}(x,\zeta)=(x,t_{kj}(x,\zeta))=(x,T_{kj}(x)\zeta)$ for all $x\in U_j\cap U_k$, $j,k\in J$, where the *transition functions* $T_{kj}:U_j\cap U_k\to GL(D,\mathbb{R})$ are smooth. The collection of pairs $\{(U_j,\psi_j)\}_{j\in J}$ is called a *vector bundle atlas* for π. We usually identify a vector bundle with its projection map. Given $U\subset\mathscr{M}$ open, we say that a local trivialization ψ over U is said to be *π-compatible* if for every $j\in J$ such that $U\cap U_j\neq\varnothing$ we have that $\psi\circ\psi_j^{-1}(x,\zeta)=(x,t_j(x,\zeta))=(x,T_j(x)\zeta)$ where $T_j:U_j\cap U\to GL(D,\mathbb{R})$ is smooth. A map $\vec\varphi:\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{E}$ is said to be a *section* of π if $\pi\circ\vec\varphi=\mathbb{1}_{\mathscr{M}}$. Notice that if, in the above discussion, we replace $\mathbb{R}^D$ by a manifold Q, and just demand that the smooth maps t_{kj} are diffeomorphisms of Q for each fixed $x\in U_j\cap U_k$ and the smooth maps t_j are diffeomorphisms of Q for each fixed $x\in U\cap U_j$ and π-compatible local trivialization ψ, $j,k\in J$, we get instead a (general) fiber bundle with typical fiber Q and bundle atlas $\{(U_j,\psi_j)\}$.

Using a vector bundle atlas one can define (fiberwise) linear combinations $\alpha\vec\varphi_1+\beta\vec\varphi_2$ of any two sections $\vec\varphi_1,\vec\varphi_2$ ($\alpha,\beta\in\mathbb{R}$) by setting $\psi_j\circ(\alpha\vec\varphi_1+\beta\vec\varphi_2)(p)=\alpha\psi_j\circ\vec\varphi_1(p)+\beta\psi_j\circ\vec\varphi_2(p)$, $p\in U_j$, $j\in J$. This definition is readily seen to be independent of the choice of vector bundle atlas with π-compatible local trivializations. In particular, every vector bundle π over $\mathscr{M}$ has a canonical section 0 (called the *zero section* of π), defined on every local trivialization ψ compatible with π by $\psi\circ 0(p)=(p,0)$, and with respect to which we can define the *support* of a section $\vec\varphi$ as $\operatorname{supp}\vec\varphi=\overline{\{p\in\mathscr{M}:\vec\varphi(p)\neq 0(p)\}}\subset\mathscr{M}$. It follows from the inverse function theorem that $\mathscr{M}$ is diffeomorphic with the range of the zero section in $\mathscr{E}$, which we also denote by 0. We denote by

$$\Gamma^\infty(\pi)=\Gamma^\infty(\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M})=\{\vec\varphi:\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{E}\text{ smooth }|\pi\circ\vec\varphi=\mathbb{1}_{\mathscr{M}}\}$$

the vector space of *smooth sections* of π, and by

$$\Gamma^\infty_c(\pi)=\Gamma^\infty_c(\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M})=\{\vec\varphi\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)|\operatorname{supp}\vec\varphi\text{ compact}\}$$

the vector space of smooth sections of π with compact support. Likewise, we denote by $\mathscr{D}'(\pi)=\mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M})=\Gamma^\infty_c(\mathscr{E}'\otimes\wedge^dT^*\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M})'$ the space of $\mathscr{E}$-valued distributions, where $\pi':\mathscr{E}'\to\mathscr{M}$ is the dual bundle of π. The fiberwise scalar multiplication turns $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$, $\Gamma^\infty_c(\pi)$ and $\mathscr{D}'(\pi)$ into $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$-modules, so that multiplication of sections by $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ is even a $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$-linear map from $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ into $\Gamma^\infty_c(\pi)$, for $\operatorname{supp}(f\vec\varphi)\subset\operatorname{supp}f$ for all $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, $\vec\varphi\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$.

We also briefly recall the notion of *jets* of smooth maps between manifolds $\mathscr{M},\mathscr{M}'$ of respective dimensions d,D, referring to [49] for a thorough exposition. Let $r\in\mathbb{N}$; we say that two smooth maps $\psi_1,\psi_2:\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M}'$ *have the same r-th order jet* at $p\in\mathscr{M}$ if for some (hence, any) coordinate charts $x:U\supset p\to\mathbb{R}^d$, $y:V\supset\psi_1(p),\psi_2(p)\to\mathbb{R}^D$, the r-th order Taylor polynomials of $y \circ \psi_1 \circ x^{-1}$ and $y \circ \psi_2 \circ x^{-1}$ at p coincide. Having the same r-th order jet at $p \in \mathscr{M}$ is clearly an equivalence relation in the space $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$ of all smooth maps from $\mathscr{M}$ into $\mathscr{M}'$, and the equivalence class of $\psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$ is called the *r-th order jet* of ψ at p, denoted by $j^r\psi(p)$. The *r-th order jet bundle* of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$, given by

$$\pi^r_0 : J^r(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}') \ni j^r\psi(p) \mapsto \pi^r_0(j^r\psi(p)) = (p, \psi(p)) \in \mathscr{M} \times \mathscr{M}' \ , \quad \psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}') \ ,$$

is an affine bundle over $\mathscr{M} \times \mathscr{M}'$, whose typical fiber is the space of r-th order, $\mathbb{R}^{d'}$-valued polynomials vanishing at $0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Given $\psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$, the corresponding section $j^r\psi : p \mapsto j^r\psi(p)$ of π^r_0 is called the *r-th order jet prolongation* of ψ. Truncation of r-th order Taylor polynomials to order $1 \leq s < r$ induces surjective submersions $\pi^r_s : J^r(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}') \to J^s(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$ which satisfy $\pi^r_r = \mathbb{1}$ and $\pi^s_t \circ \pi^r_s = \pi^r_t$ for all $0 \leq t \leq s \leq r$, which allow one to define the projective limit $\pi^\infty_0 : J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}') \to \mathscr{M} \times \mathscr{M}'$, called the *infinite-order jet bundle* of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$. One can then identify the sequence $(j^r\psi)_{r\geq 0}$ of jet prolongations with a section $j^\infty\psi$ of $J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$, called simply the *infinite-order jet prolongation* of ψ. $J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{M}')$, being a countable projective limit of second-countable, finite-dimensional manifolds, can be made into a second-countable, metrizable Fréchet manifold [51]. If $\pi : \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{M}$ is a fiber bundle over $\mathscr{M}$, we can define the subspace $J^r(\pi) \subset J^r(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{E})$ of r-jets $X = j^r\psi(p)$ of smooth *sections* ψ of π (i.e. smooth maps from $\mathscr{M}$ to $\mathscr{E}$ satisfying $\pi \circ \psi = \mathbb{1}_{\mathscr{M}}$), $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. Then we can identify $\pi^r_0|_{J^r(\pi)}$ with $\mathrm{pr}_2 \circ \pi^r_0$, and we call the affine bundle $\pi^r_0 : J^r(\pi) \to \mathscr{E}$ the *r-th order jet bundle* of π.

2.2. **Topology and geometry of the space of field configurations.** Let $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ be a globally hyperbolic space-time, and $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) = \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$ be the space of real-valued smooth functions on $\mathscr{M}$. We call $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ a(n *off-shell*) *space of (real scalar) field configurations*[1]. It can be topologized in two different ways by means of the infinite-order jet prolongation of its elements, as follows. Let $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$ be the space of continuous functions from $\mathscr{M}$ into $J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$. The *compact-open* topology on $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$ is generated by the sub-basis

$$\mathscr{U}_{K,V} = \{X \in \mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})) | X(K) \subset V\} \ ,$$

for all $K \subset \mathscr{M}$ compact, $V \subset J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$ open. The initial topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \ni \varphi$ induced by the compact-open topology on $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$ through the map $\varphi \mapsto j^\infty\varphi$ is also called the *compact-open* topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. The *graph* (or *Whitney*) topology on $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$, on its turn, is given by taking

$$\mathscr{U}_W = \{X \in \mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})) | (p, X(p)) \in W \text{ for all } p \in \mathscr{M}\} \ ,$$

for all $W \subset \mathscr{M} \times J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$ open in the product topology, as a basis of open sets. Obviously, to have $\mathscr{U}_W \neq \varnothing$ one needs W to satisfy $\mathrm{pr}_1(W) = \mathscr{M}$. As $J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$ is metrizable and $\mathscr{M}$ is paracompact, another basis for this topology is given around any $Y \in \mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$ by $\{X \in \mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})) | d(X(p), Y(p)) < \epsilon(p)\}$, for all positive $\epsilon \in \mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$. The initial topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \ni \varphi$ induced by the graph topology on $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$ through the single map $\varphi \mapsto j^\infty\varphi$ is called the *Whitney* topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. It is in general finer than the compact-open topology, and coincides with the latter if and only if $\mathscr{M}$ is compact, which is *not* our case. On the other hand, notice that since $\mathscr{M}$ is locally compact (for $\mathscr{M}$ is finite dimensional) and second countable, we have that $\mathscr{M}$ is *σ-compact*, that is, $\mathscr{M}$ admits a so-called *exhaustion* by a sequence $K_n \subset \mathring{K}_{n+1}$ of compact regions $K_n \subset \mathscr{M}$, which means that $\cup_{n=1}^{\infty} K_n = \mathscr{M}$. We can then use any exhaustion $(K_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of $\mathscr{M}$ to show that any set $\mathscr{U}_W$ as above must be a *G_δ set* (i.e. a countable intersection of open sets) in the compact-open topology of $\mathscr{C}(\mathscr{M}, J^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$. Indeed, we have that

---

[1] Some physics texts, such as [23], call $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ the *space of field histories* on $\mathscr{M}$.

$$\mathscr{U}_W = \bigcap_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathscr{U}_{K_n, \mathrm{pr}_2(W)} \ ,$$

where pr_2 is an open mapping. Therefore, the Whitney topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ admits a basis made of G_δ subsets of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ in the compact-open topology.

The compact-open topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \ni \varphi$ can be understood as the topology of uniform convergence of all derivatives of φ on compact regions $K \subset \mathscr{M}$, as induced by the seminorms

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varphi\|_{\infty,k,K} &\doteq \sup_{p\in K} \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{k} |\nabla^j \varphi(p)|_e^2} \ , \\ |\nabla^j\varphi|_e^2 &\doteq \otimes^j e^{-1}(\nabla^j\varphi, \nabla^j\varphi) \ , \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\otimes^j e^{-1}$ is the Riemannian metric induced on the bundle $\otimes^j T^*\mathscr{M}$ of covariant tensors of rank j on $\mathscr{M}$ by a Riemannian metric e on $T\mathscr{M}$, and $\nabla^j\varphi$ is the iterated covariant derivative of order j of φ with respect to a torsion-free connection ∇ on $T\mathscr{M}$, given recursively by

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla^1\varphi &= \nabla\varphi = \mathrm{d}\varphi \ , \\ \nabla^j\varphi(X_1, \ldots, X_j) &= \nabla_{X_1}\nabla^{j-1}\varphi(X_2, \ldots, X_j) \\ &\quad - \sum_{l=2}^{j} \nabla^{j-1}\varphi(X_2, \ldots, X_{l-1}, \nabla_{X_1}X_l, X_{l+1}, \ldots, X_j) \ . \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

A countable family of seminorms is obtained by exploiting the σ-compactness of $\mathscr{M}$ and choosing an exhaustion $(K_n)_{n\geq 1}$ of $\mathscr{M}$ as above. The topology induced by the seminorms $\|\cdot\|_{\infty,k,K_n}$ is then independent of the choice of e, ∇ and the exhaustion $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$. It is clearly a vector space topology with respect to the standard vector space operations in a function space, and gives rise to a Fréchet space structure on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. An equivalent, separating family of seminorms generating this topology is given by

$$\|\varphi\|_{\infty,k,f} \doteq \sup_{p\in\mathscr{M}} \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{k} |f(p)\nabla^j\varphi(p)|_e^2} \ , \tag{3}$$

where f runs over the space $\mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \doteq \mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R})$ of real-valued smooth functions with compact support. To see the equivalence, let $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ taking values in $[0, 1]$ such that $f_n \equiv 1$ in K_n and $\operatorname{supp} f_n \subset \mathring{K}_{n+1}$, where $(K_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is the exhaustion of $\mathscr{M}$ defined above. Then one clearly has $\|\varphi\|_{\infty,k,K_n} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty,k,f_n} \leq \|\varphi\|_{\infty,k,K_{n+1}}$ for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. Finally, yet another equivalent, separating family of seminorms generating the compact-open topology which will play a major role in this work is given by the *local Sobolev seminorms*

$$\|\varphi\|_{2,k,K} \doteq \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{k}\int_K |\nabla^j\varphi|_e^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_e} \ , \quad K\subset\mathscr{M} \text{ compact}, \mathring{K}\neq\varnothing \ , \tag{4}$$

$$\|\varphi\|_{2,k,f} \doteq \sqrt{\sum_{j=0}^{k}\int_{\mathscr{M}} |f\nabla^j\varphi|_e^2 \mathrm{d}\mu_e} \ , \quad f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M}) \ , \tag{5}$$

where $\mathrm{d}\mu_e$ is the volume element associated to the Riemannian metric e on $\mathscr{M}$. The equivalence can be established by means of the sequence $(f_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ defined above together with the Sobolev inequalities, using a partition of unity subordinated to a finite covering of supp f_n by suitable domains of coordinate charts for each $n\in\mathbb{N}$.

2.2.1. Remark. Formulae (1)–(5) can be extended to the space $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ of smooth sections of a vector bundle $\pi:\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M}$ over $\mathscr{M}$: given a torsion-free connection $\bar\nabla$ on $\mathscr{E}$ and a torsion-free connection ∇ on $T\mathscr{M}$, we can combine them into a torsion-free connection on $\otimes^k T^*\mathscr{M}\otimes\mathscr{E}$ for all k by using Leibniz's rule. We denote such a connection by ∇ for all $k\geq 0$, since there will be no danger of confusion. Once we write $\nabla^1\vec\varphi(X)=\nabla_X\vec\varphi$ for all $\vec\varphi\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$, $X\in\Gamma^\infty(T\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M})$, we can define k-th order iterated covariant derivatives $\nabla^k\vec\varphi$ of $\vec\varphi\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ for all $k\geq 2$ by means of (2). We can now endow $\mathscr{E}$ with a Riemannian fiber metric $\bar e$ and define

$$|\nabla^k\vec\varphi|^2_{\bar e} = ((\otimes^k\bar e^{-1})\otimes\bar e)(\nabla^k\vec\varphi,\nabla^k\vec\varphi) \ . \tag{6}$$

Substituting (6) into (1) and (3)–(5) allows us to define the seminorms $\|\vec\varphi\|_{p,k,f}$, $\|\vec\varphi\|_{p,k,K}$ of $\vec\varphi\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ for all $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, $\varnothing\neq\mathring{K}\subset K\subset\mathscr{M}$ compact, $p=2,\infty$.

The Whitney topology on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, unlike the compact-open topology, is *not* a vector space topology in general. Since a sequence $(\varphi_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converges to $\psi\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ in this topology if and only if there is a compact subset $K\subset\mathscr{M}$ such that $\psi_n(p)=\psi(p)$ for all $p\in\mathscr{M}\smallsetminus K$ and ψ_n converges uniformly to ψ on K together with all its derivatives [51], we see that scalar multiplication is not Whitney-continuous at zero unless $\mathscr{M}$ is compact.

Nonetheless, the Whitney topology induces on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ the structure of a *flat affine manifold*, modelled over the subspace $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. To wit, for every $\varphi\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ there is an open neighborhood basis on φ of the form $\mathscr{U}+\varphi=\{\varphi+\vec\varphi|\vec\varphi\in\mathscr{U}\}$, where $\mathscr{U}$ runs over a basis of open neighborhoods of zero in $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ in the latter's usual inductive limit topology. In particular, the connected component of φ in the Whitney topology is exactly $\varphi+\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. The coordinate chart associated to $\mathscr{U}+\varphi$ is then given by $\kappa_\varphi(\varphi+\vec\varphi)=\vec\varphi$, and the coordinate change map from $\mathscr{U}_1$ to $\mathscr{U}_2$ is given by $\kappa_{\varphi_2}\circ\kappa^{-1}_{\varphi_1}(\vec\varphi_1)=\vec\varphi_1+(\varphi_1-\varphi_2)$, which is clearly affine. We remark that, due to the aforementioned connectedness property of the Whitney topology, the respective domains $\mathscr{U}_1+\varphi_1$, $\mathscr{U}_2+\varphi_2$ of κ_{φ_1} and κ_{φ_2} have nonvoid intersection if and only if $\varphi_1-\varphi_2$ has compact support, in which case we conclude from the argument in the previous paragraph that $\kappa^{-1}_{\varphi_1}\circ\kappa_{\varphi_2}$ is even continuous with respect to the Whitney topology.

As argued in Appendix A, the notion of smooth curves in the modelling space $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ allows one as well to use the atlas

$$\mathfrak{U} = \{(\mathscr{U} + \varphi, \kappa_\varphi) | \mathscr{U} \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M}) \ni 0 \text{ open}, \varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})\} \ . \tag{7}$$

we have built in the previous paragraph to induce a *smooth* manifold structure on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. In particular, due to the affine structure of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, the tangent and cotangent bundles of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ are trivial, being respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned} T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) &= \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \times \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M}) \ , \\ T^*\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) &= \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \times \mathscr{D}'(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) \ , \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{D}'(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) = \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})'$ is the space of d-form-valued distributions on $\mathscr{M}$. We endow $T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ with a flat connection, to be defined as follows. The parallel transport operator $P^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}_\gamma(\gamma(\lambda_1), \vec{t}) = (\gamma(\lambda_2), \vec{t})$ on $T\mathbb{R} = \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}$ along $\gamma \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R}, \mathbb{R})$ associated to the standard flat connection on the target space $\mathbb{R}$ of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ can be pulled back to $T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ by setting

$$P^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}_\alpha(\alpha(\lambda_1, \cdot), \vec{\varphi})(p) \doteq (\alpha(\lambda_2, p), \vec{\varphi}(p)) = P^{\lambda_1,\lambda_2}_{\alpha(\cdot,p)}(\alpha(\lambda_1, p), \vec{\varphi}(p)) \ ,$$

where $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{M} \to \mathbb{R}$ defines a smooth curve in $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ with respect to the Whitney topology (see Appendix A). Given sections X, Y of $T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ taking smooth curves in $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ with respect to the Whitney topology to smooth curves in $T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, we may define at each $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$

$$D_Y X[\varphi] = \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}|_{\lambda=0} \left(P^{\lambda,0}_\alpha X[\alpha(\lambda, \cdot)] \right) \ , \tag{8}$$

where $\alpha : \mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is a smooth curve such that $\alpha(0, p) = \varphi(p)$ and $\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}|_{\lambda=0}\alpha(\lambda, p) = \mathrm{pr}_2(Y[\varphi])(p)$. An example of such a curve is

$$\alpha(\lambda, p) = \varphi(p) + \lambda \mathrm{pr}_2(Y[\varphi])(p) \ . \tag{9}$$

We say that D is the *ultralocal lift* of the standard flat connection on the target space[2] $\mathbb{R}$, for $D_Y X[\varphi](p)$ depends only on $\varphi(p)$. In what follows, we automatically extend D to all covariant and contravariant tensor fields on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ (see Appendix A for a precise definition) in the standard fashion, i.e. by tensoring and taking adjoint inverses of the parallel transport operator.

It is clear from the above definition that P_α defined above is the parallel transport operator along α associated to D. It is a consequence of the ultralocality of D, however, that much more is true:

(1) The geodesic α starting at $(\varphi, \vec{\varphi}) \in T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is given by (9). As a consequence, the exponential map $\exp_D : T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \times \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ of D is complete and given by

$$\exp_D(\varphi, \vec{\varphi}) = (\varphi, \varphi + \vec{\varphi}) = (\varphi, \kappa_\varphi(\vec{\varphi})) \ .$$

In other words, the chart κ_φ is precisely the normal coordinate chart around φ associated to D.

---

[2] In the context of field theory, such connections were formally introduced in [23]. For a precise, general concept of ultralocal lifts of connections on target spaces, see for instance Example 4.5.3, pp. 94 of [37].

(2) The curvature tensor of D is given by

$$\mathrm{Riem}_D(X,Y)[\varphi](p) = \mathrm{Riem}_{\varphi(p)}(X[\varphi](p), Y[\varphi](p)) = 0\ ,$$

where $\mathrm{Riem}_t \equiv 0$ is the Riemann curvature of the standard flat connection on the target space $\mathbb{R}$ at the point t. As a consequence, the k-th order iterated covariant derivative $D^k X(Y_1,\ldots,Y_k)$ of a tensor field X along vector fields $Y_1,\ldots,Y_k$ is *symmetric* in $Y_1,\ldots,Y_k$ for all k.

We close this Subsection with two technical Lemmata. The first is a simple but useful manifestation of the fact that the Whitney topology is finer than the compact-open topology:

2.2.2. Lemma. *Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open with respect to the Whitney topology. Then for every $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$, $V \subset \mathscr{M}$ open, there is a $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ such that* $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi - \varphi_0) \neq \varnothing$ *is compact and contained in V, and $\lambda(\varphi - \varphi_0) \in \mathscr{U} - \varphi_0$ for all $\lambda \in [-1,1]$.*

Proof. By the reasoning in the paragraphs preceding this Lemma, there is an absolutely convex open neighborhood $\mathscr{V}$ of zero in $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ contained in $\mathscr{U} - \varphi_0$. Given any $\varphi_1 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, there is a $t_1 > 0$ such that $t\psi_1 \in \mathscr{V}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with $|t| \leq t_1$, since $\mathscr{V}$ is absorbent. Choose φ_1 with $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_1 \subset V$, set $\varphi = \varphi_0 + t_1\varphi_1$, and we are done. □

The second allows one to strengthen the conclusion of Lemma 2.2.2:

2.2.3. Lemma. *Let $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, $r \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, $p \in \mathscr{M}$. Then there is $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ satisfying $j^r\varphi(p) = j^r\varphi_0(p)$, such that* $\operatorname{supp}(\varphi - \varphi_0) \neq \varnothing$ *is contained in an arbitrarily small open neighborhood U of p with compact closure K, and $\|\varphi' - \varphi_0\|_{\infty,r,K} < \epsilon$ for $\epsilon > 0$ arbitrarily small.*

Proof. Since we are dealing with a local statement, we assume without loss of generality that $\mathscr{M} = \mathbb{R}^d$, $p = 0$, $\varphi_0 \equiv 0$, e is the standard Euclidean metric and $\nabla = \partial$ is the associated (flat) Levi-Civita connection. Let now $\varphi' \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be such that $j^r\varphi'(p) = j^r\varphi_0(p)$; it follows from Taylor's formula with remainder that $\partial^\alpha\varphi'(x) = O(\|x\|^{r+1-|\alpha|})$ as $\|x\| \to 0$, for all multi-indices α such that $0 \leq |\alpha| \leq r$. Let $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $f(x) = 1$ for $\|x\| \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and $f(x) = 0$ for $\|x\| \geq 1$. Given $R > 0$, define $f_R(x) = f(R^{-1}x)$. It follows from the chain rule that $\partial^\alpha f_R(x) = R^{-|\alpha|}(\partial^\alpha f)(R^{-1}x)$. Define now $\varphi = f_R\varphi'$; Leibniz's rule gives us that

$$\|\varphi\|_{\infty,r,K} \leq C_{r,K}\|\varphi'\|_{\infty,r,\overline{B_R(0)}}\|f\|_{\infty,r,\overline{B_1(0)}}R$$

for all $K \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\mathring{K} \supset \overline{B_R(0)}$, where $B_\lambda(0) = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d | \|x\| < \lambda\}$. Taking R sufficiently small yields the desired bound. □

2.3. **Functionals as observables.** Our observable quantities will be maps $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathbb{C}$ which we call *functionals*, where $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is usually some open set in the compact-open topology, though we may occasionally consider more general subsets. The need to localize the domain of definition of functionals comes from the fact that, when we study full nonlinear dynamics in the second paper of this series, we will be led to consider functionals which are not *a priori* defined for *all* field configurations. We shall now introduce a concept which tells us in which sense functionals are localized in a certain region of space-time, following [12].

2.3.1. Definition (Space-time support). Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. The *space-time support* $\operatorname{supp} F$ of a functional $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathbb{C}$ is the (closed) subset composed by the points $p \in \mathscr{M}$ such that for any neighborhood U of p we can find $\psi \in \mathscr{U}, \varphi \in \mathscr{U} - \psi$ with $\operatorname{supp} \varphi \subset U$ for which $F(\varphi + \psi) \neq F(\psi)$. The space of functionals over $\mathscr{U}$ with *compact* space-time support in $\mathscr{M}$ will be denoted by $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$.

In other words, a functional F is insensitive to disturbances of its argument which are localized outside $\operatorname{supp} F$. As shown by Lemma 2.3.8 below, Definition 2.3.1 gives a nonlinear generalization of the notion of support of a distribution. It is important, on the one hand, to emphasize that Definition 2.3.1 depends on the domain of definition $\mathscr{U}$ of F. For instance, if we restrict F to a smaller domain of definition $\mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{U}$, then $\operatorname{supp} F$ will in general be a *smaller* subset of $\mathscr{M}$ (see Remark 2.3.2 right below). On the other hand, the domain of definition of F will always be clear from the context, so we refrain from referring to it in the notation.

2.3.2. Remark. Let us give some simple examples of functionals. Given a compact region $K \subset \mathscr{M}$ of the space-time manifold $\mathscr{M}$ and $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ satisfying $\int_{\mathscr{M}} f \mathrm{d}\mu_g = 1$, we define the functionals $F, G, H : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathbb{C}$ as

$$F(\varphi) = \|\varphi\|_{\infty,0,K} = \sup_K |\varphi| \ , \quad G(\varphi) = \int_{\mathscr{M}} f\varphi \mathrm{d}\mu_g \ , \quad H(\varphi) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{1+\sup_{\mathscr{M}} |\varphi|} & \varphi \text{ bounded} \ , \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \ . \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

One clearly sees that F and G have compact space-time support (indeed, we have that $\operatorname{supp} F = K$ and $\operatorname{supp} G = \operatorname{supp} f$), whereas H does not. Other examples are the local Sobolev seminorms $\|\varphi\|_{2,k,K}$ and $\|\varphi\|_{2,k,f}$ respectively defined in (4) and (5). We shall now give a slightly more complicated example which explicitly displays the dependence of the space-time support of a functional on the latter's domain. Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ be a smooth function such that $\chi(t) = 1$ if $|t| \leq 1$, and $\chi(t) = 0$ if $|t| \geq 2$. Setting $\chi_R(t) = \chi(R^{-1}t)$ for $R > 0$, define

$$G_R(\varphi) = \exp\left(1 - \chi_R \circ G(\varphi)\right) \ , \tag{11}$$

with G as defined in (10). Let now $\mathscr{U}_{R'} = \{\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) | \|\varphi\|_{\infty,0,\operatorname{supp} f} < R'\}$ for $R' > 0$; we have that

$$\operatorname{supp} G_R|_{\mathscr{U}_{R'}} = \begin{cases} \varnothing & R' \leq R \ , \\ \operatorname{supp} f & R' > R \ . \end{cases}$$

Indeed, in the first case, we have that $G_R|_{\mathscr{U}_{R'}} \equiv 1$.

We endow each $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$, for $\mathscr{U} \ni \varphi$ running over the compact-open topology of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, with the following pointwise algebraic operations:

- Sum $F, G \mapsto (F + G)(\varphi) \doteq F(\varphi) + G(\varphi)$;
- Product $F, G \mapsto (F \cdot G)(\varphi) \doteq F(\varphi)G(\varphi)$;
- Involution $F \mapsto F^*(\varphi) \doteq \overline{F(\varphi)}$;
- Multiplication by scalars $z \in \mathbb{C}$, $F \mapsto (z \cdot F)(\varphi) \doteq zF(\varphi)$;
- Unit $\mathbb{1} : \varphi \mapsto 1$.

Now we show that the algebraic operations of $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ preserve space-time supports. As a direct consequence, these operations turn $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ into a commutative unital *-algebra. Firstly, it is trivial to check that the scalar multiplication by any $0\neq\lambda\in\mathbb{C}$ and the involution leave the support unchanged, whereas any scalar multiple of $\mathbb{1}$ has empty space-time support. The full assertion is then a consequence of the following

2.3.3. Lemma. *Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, F,G functionals over $\mathscr{U}$. Then:*

- *The sum $F+G$ satisfies*

$$\operatorname{supp}(F+G)\subset\operatorname{supp}F\cup\operatorname{supp}G\ ;$$

- *The product $F\cdot G$ satisfies*

$$\operatorname{supp}(F\cdot G)\subset\operatorname{supp}F\cup\operatorname{supp}G\ .$$

*In particular, $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ is a commutative unital *-algebra.*

Proof. Let us assume that $p\notin\operatorname{supp}F\cup\operatorname{supp}G$, that is,

$$p\in\complement(\operatorname{supp}F\cup\operatorname{supp}G)=\complement\operatorname{supp}F\cap\complement\operatorname{supp}G\ .$$

By the definition of space-time support, there is an open neighborhood V of p such that for all $\varphi_0\in\mathscr{U}$, $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}-\varphi_0$ satisfying $\operatorname{supp}\varphi\subset V$, we have that $F(\varphi_0+\varphi)=F(\varphi_0)$ and $G(\varphi_0+\varphi)=\mathfrak{G}(\varphi_0)$, hence $(F+G)(\varphi_0+\varphi)=(F+G)(\varphi_0)$ and $(F\cdot G)(\varphi_0+\varphi)=(F\cdot G)(\varphi_0)$ for all such φ_0,φ. This entails that $p\notin\operatorname{supp}(F+G)$ and $p\notin\operatorname{supp}(F\cdot G)$, as desired. $\square$

We emphasize that, unlike for supports of functions on $\mathscr{M}$, the stronger property $\operatorname{supp}(F\cdot G)\subset\operatorname{supp}F\cap\operatorname{supp}G$ *does not* hold for space-time supports of functionals. A counter-example is given by $F=G_{R_1}$ and $G=G_{R_2}$ with $R_1<R_2$, where G_R is defined for all $R>0$ in (11). The reason is that the notion of space-time support is a *relative* one; it is not necessarily true that $F(\varphi)$ vanishes if φ is supported outside $\operatorname{supp}F$. For instance, given $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, we have that the functional $F(\varphi)=\int_{\mathscr{M}}f\exp(\varphi)d\mu_g$ satisfy $F(\varphi)=1$ for all $\varphi\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ such that $\operatorname{supp}\varphi\cap\operatorname{supp}f=\varnothing$. In the above counter-example, we also have that G_R is nowhere vanishing for all $R>0$.

The *raison d'être* of Definition 2.3.1 becomes evident if one assumes the following property:

2.3.4. Definition (Additivity). Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. A functional $F\in\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ is said to be *additive* if for all $\varphi_2\in\mathscr{U}$, $\varphi_1,\varphi_3\in\mathscr{U}-\varphi_2$ such that $\varphi_1+\varphi_3\in\mathscr{U}-\varphi_2$ and $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_1\cap\operatorname{supp}\varphi_3=\varnothing$ we have

$$F(\varphi_1+\varphi_2+\varphi_3)=F(\varphi_1+\varphi_2)-F(\varphi_2)+F(\varphi_2+\varphi_3)\tag{12}$$

or, more concisely,

$$F_{\varphi_1}(\varphi_2+\varphi_3)=F_{\varphi_1}(\varphi_2)+F_{\varphi_1}(\varphi_3)\tag{13}$$

where $F_\varphi(\psi)\doteq F(\psi+\varphi)-F(\varphi)$.

As it will be seen shortly, this notion essentially captures what it means for $F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ to be *local* with respect to the space-time $\mathscr{M}$. For instance, in the case that $\mathscr{U} = \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ we have[3] the following nonlinear analog of a partition of unity, introduced in Lemma 3.2 of [12]. Its simple proof is included here for the convenience of the reader.

2.3.5. Lemma. *Any additive functional $F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))$ can be decomposed as a finite sum of additive functionals with arbitrarily small space-time support.*

Proof. First of all, let us endow $\mathscr{M}$ with a complete auxiliary Riemannian metric h, whose associated distance function is given by $d_h : \mathscr{M} \times \mathscr{M} \to \overline{\mathbb{R}_+}$. In what follows, by "distance" between $p, q \in \mathscr{M}$ we mean $d_h(p,q)$, and a "ball of radius R", an open set $\{q \in \mathscr{M} : d_h(p,q) < R\}$ for some $p \in \mathscr{M}$.

Let $\epsilon > 0$ be arbitrary, and $(B_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ a finite covering of $\operatorname{supp} F$ by balls of radius $\epsilon/4$. Associate to this covering a subordinate partition of unity $(\chi_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$. By a repeated use of the additivity of F we arrive at a decomposition of the form

$$F_K = \sum_I s_I F_I \ , \tag{14}$$

with $s_I \in \{\pm 1\}$, $F_I(\varphi) = F_K(\varphi \sum_{i\in I} \chi_i)$, where $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ and I runs over all subsets of $\{1,\dots,n\}$ such that $B_i \cap B_j \neq \varnothing$ for all $i, j \in I$. It is obvious that F_I is again an additive functional, and from the definition of space-time support we immediately find that $\operatorname{supp} F_I \subset \bigcup_{i\in I} B_i \doteq B_I$. Since any two points in B_I have distance less than ϵ, then each B_I is contained in a ball of radius ϵ. □

2.3.6. Remark. The concept of an additive functional, although not exactly mainstream, is by no means new in the mathematical literature (consider [65] as a starting point). In the present case, it was motivated by the study of the set of possible counterterms generated by all choices of renormalization prescription in perturbative algebraic quantum field theory [28, 12]. We have already seen examples of additive functionals, such as the square of the local Sobolev seminorm (5). Counter-examples include the functional F defined in (10) and the functional G_R defined in (11).

A further property we will demand from our functionals concerns their differentiability. We will just spell the complete definition we need for convenience, which builds on the discussion in Appendix A.

2.3.7. Definition. Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology. We say that a functional $F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ is *differentiable of order m* if for all $k = 1,\dots,m$ the k-th order directional (Gâteaux) derivatives (henceforth called *functional derivatives*)

$$F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\dots,\vec{\varphi}_k) = \left\langle F^{(k)}[\varphi], \vec{\varphi}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \vec{\varphi}_k \right\rangle \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} F\left(\varphi + \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j \vec{\varphi}_j\right) \tag{15}$$

---

[3] The restriction on $\mathscr{U}$ can be weakened in a certain sense. See Lemma 3.1.5.

exist as jointly continuous maps from $\mathscr{U} \times \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})^k$ to $\mathbb{R}$, where $\langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle$ denotes dual pairing. In particular, for each φ fixed, $F^{(k)}[\varphi]$ is a distribution *density* of compact support on $\mathscr{M}^k$. If F is differentiable of order m for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that F is *smooth*.

In certain cases, we can extend Definition 2.3.7 to the case when $\mathscr{U}$ is no longer open (see Appendix A).

The relation of the notion of space-time support of a functional to the notion of support of a distribution can be made more transparent for *differentiable* elements of $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$:

2.3.8. Lemma. *Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology and convex. If $F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ is a differentiable functional of order one, then*

$$\operatorname{supp} F = \overline{\bigcup_{\varphi\in\mathscr{U}} \operatorname{supp} F^{(1)}[\varphi]}\ . \tag{16}$$

Proof. If $p \in \operatorname{supp} F$, then by definition there are $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$, $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{U} - \varphi$ with $\vec{\varphi}$ supported in a neighborhood of p such that $F(\varphi+\vec{\varphi}) \neq F(\varphi)$. By the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99), there is a $\lambda_0 \in (0,1)$ such that $F^{(1)}[\varphi+\lambda_0\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi}) \neq 0$ (this is the only place where convexity of $\mathscr{U}$ is used). This implies the inclusion $\operatorname{supp} F \subset \overline{\bigcup_{\varphi\in\mathscr{U}} \operatorname{supp} F^{(1)}[\varphi]}$.

For the opposite one we argue as follows. Let us suppose that $p \in \operatorname{supp} F^{(1)}[\varphi]$, then this means that there is a $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ supported in a neighborhood of p such that $F^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}) \neq 0$, whence it follows that $F(\varphi+\lambda\vec{\varphi}) \neq F(\varphi)$ for all λ chosen sufficiently small (depending on $\vec{\varphi}$) so that $\varphi+\lambda\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{U}$. We then conclude that $p \in \operatorname{supp} F$, i.e.

$$\operatorname{supp} F^{(1)}[\varphi] \subset \operatorname{supp} F\ .$$

Taking the union of the left-hand side with respect to all $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ and closing implies the thesis. □

We remark that the same argument used in Lemma 2.3.8 to prove the inclusion $\operatorname{supp} F^{(1)}[\varphi] \subset \operatorname{supp} F$ can be used to show that if F is differentiable of order $m \geq 1$, then $\operatorname{supp} F^{(k)}[\varphi] \subset (\operatorname{supp} F)^k$ for all $1 \leq k \leq m$.

We shall now display formula (16) in action using a specific example. Let $G_R = G_R|_{\mathscr{U}_{R'}} \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U}_{R'})$ be the functional defined as in (11). By Faà di Bruno's formula (104), one sees that G_R is smooth for all $R, R' > 0$. In particular, by the chain rule (100),

$$G_R^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}) = -\frac{1}{R} G_R(\varphi)(\chi')_R \circ G(\varphi)G(\vec{\varphi})\ .$$

When $R' \leq R$, we have that $(\chi')_R \circ G(\varphi) = 0$ for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}_{R'}$, whence $G_R^{(1)}[\varphi] = 0$ for all such φ. If $R' > R$, then we have that $\operatorname{supp} G_R^{(1)}[\varphi] = \varnothing$ if $\|\varphi\|_{\infty,0,\operatorname{supp} f} \leq R$, and $\operatorname{supp} G_R^{(1)}[\varphi] = \operatorname{supp} f$ if $R < \|\varphi\|_{\infty,0,\operatorname{supp} f} < R'$.

2.3.9. Remark. A natural question that arises at this point, whose answer is in general evaded in the literature, is how Definition 2.3.7 fits into the manifold structure of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ induced by the Whitney topology. This question is answered by means of the following fact: given any compact region $K \subset \mathscr{M}$ and any nonvoid subset $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, one can uniquely extend any $F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ with $\operatorname{supp} F \subset K$ to the subset $i_\chi^{-1}(\mathscr{U})$, where $i_\chi : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \varphi_0 + \mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is defined by $i_\chi(\varphi) = \varphi_0 + \chi(\varphi - \varphi_0)$, $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$ is fixed and $\chi \in \mathscr{C}_c^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ satisfies $\chi(p) = 1$ for all

$p \in K$. It is clear that i_χ is a continuous (in fact, even smooth) map from $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ into itself, if the domain is endowed with the *compact-open* topology and the codomain is endowed with the *Whitney* topology. In particular, if $\mathscr{U}$ is a connected, Whitney-open neighborhood of φ_0, then $i_\chi^{-1}(\mathscr{U})$ is open in the compact-open topology, where $F^{(k)}$ becomes uniquely defined whenever it exists, for all $k \geq 1$. Moreover, since $\operatorname{supp} F^{(k)}[\varphi] \subset (\operatorname{supp} F)^k$, one also concludes that

$$F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) = F^{(k)}[\varphi](\chi\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \chi\vec{\varphi}_k) = D^k F[\varphi](\chi\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \chi\vec{\varphi}_k) \ , \tag{17}$$

where $\chi\vec{\varphi}_j$ is understood as the covariantly constant vector field $\varphi \mapsto (\varphi, \chi\vec{\varphi})$, $1 \leq j \leq k$. Since the left hand side of the above formula is independent of χ, we just write

$$F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) = D^k F[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) \ . \tag{18}$$

In particular, $D^k F$ defines a smooth tensor field on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ when the latter is endowed with the smooth manifold structure induced from $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ (see Remark A.0.2 and the discussion preceding it).

Throughout the paper, our functionals F of interest will always be smooth functionals with compact space-time support. Thanks to Remark 2.3.9, if F is only defined in an open subset $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ in the Whitney topology, we can uniquely extend such a F to an open subset $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \supset \tilde{\mathscr{U}} \supset \mathscr{U}$ in the compact-open topology and unambiguously define $F^{(k)}$ therein for all $k \geq 1$. Three very important spaces of such functionals are the following:

2.3.10. Definition. Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open with respect to the compact-open topology. The vector subspaces of $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ given by

$$\mathscr{F}_0(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) = \{F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) \text{ smooth} \mid F^{(k)}[\varphi] \in \Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^{kd} T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k), \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{U},\, k \geq 1\} \ , \tag{19}$$

$$\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) = \{F \in \mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) \text{ smooth} \mid \operatorname{supp} F^{(2)}[\varphi] \subset \Delta_2(\mathscr{M}), \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{U}\} \text{ and} \tag{20}$$

$$\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) = \{F \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) | F^{(1)}[\varphi] \in \Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}), \forall \varphi \in \mathscr{U}\} \ , \tag{21}$$

where $\Delta_k(\mathscr{M}) = \{(p, \dots, p) \in \mathscr{M}^k : p \in \mathscr{M}\}$ is the small diagonal of $\mathscr{M}$ in $\mathscr{M}^k$, are said to be respectively the spaces of *regular*, *local* and *microlocal* functionals over $\mathscr{U}$.

Criterion (20) for locality of a functional was put forward in [28] in the case of functionals depending polynomially on the field configuration. We stress that $\mathscr{F}_0(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ is even a *-subalgebra of $\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$.

Microlocal functionals comprise many functionals of physical interest. For instance, let $\omega \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^* J^r(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}) \to J^r(\mathscr{M}, \mathbb{R}))$; given any $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, the functional

$$F(\varphi) = \int_{\mathscr{M}} f (j^r \varphi)^* \omega \tag{22}$$

is clearly seen to be microlocal over any $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ open in the compact-open topology. Conversely, it will be shown in Proposition 2.3.12 below that all microlocal functionals are essentially of this form. The above example becomes somewhat trivial if we take instead a closed p-form ω on $J^r(\mathscr{M},\mathbb{R})$ with $p<d$, and define

$$G(\varphi)=\int_{\mathscr{N}}(j^r\varphi)^*\omega\ , \tag{23}$$

where $\mathscr{N}\subset\mathscr{M}$ is a compact, p-dimensional submanifold without boundary. More precisely, it can be shown [76] that $DG[\varphi](\vec{\varphi})$ for G as in (23) is represented by the integral over $\mathscr{N}$ of an *exact* p-form on $\mathscr{M}$, hence $DG[\varphi]=0$ for all $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$. In particular, $\operatorname{supp}G=\varnothing$, that is, G is locally constant. If ω is not closed or $\mathscr{N}$ has a nonvoid boundary, then G is still a local functional, but *not* microlocal.

It is easy to display examples of smooth functionals with compact space-time support which are *not* local. If $F,G\in\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$, Leibniz's rule (101) applied twice to $(F\cdot G)^{(2)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\vec{\varphi}_2)$ gives rise to a term of the form $F^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1)G^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_2)+G^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1)F^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_2)$, whose kernel for fixed φ is represented by a smooth, compactly supported density on $\mathscr{M}^2$ and hence *not* supported on $\Delta_2(\mathscr{M})$ unless it is identically zero, in which case either F or G must be constant. Hence, we conclude that $F\cdot G$ cannot be local if $\operatorname{supp}F,\operatorname{supp}G\neq\varnothing$. It follows from the same argument (using Faà di Bruno's formula (104) instead of Leibniz's rule) that if, for instance, $\psi:\mathbb{C}\to\mathbb{C}$ is entire analytic and not affine, and G is microlocal with $\operatorname{supp}G\neq\varnothing$, then $F=\psi\circ G$ cannot be local. A typical such example is

$$F(\varphi)=\exp\left(\int_{\mathscr{M}}\varphi\omega\right)\ ,\quad \omega\in\Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^dT^*\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M})\ , \tag{24}$$

which even happens to be regular. In fact, one immediately sees that a regular functional is local if and only if it is affine, in which case it is also microlocal.

Returning to the general development of our framework, now we are in a position to make more precise the claim preceding Lemma 2.3.5, sharpening Lemma 3.1 of [12].

2.3.11. Proposition. *Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open with respect to the compact-open topology, and $F\in\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ be smooth. Then F belongs to $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ if and only if it is additive. Moreover, in this case we have that* $\operatorname{supp}F^{(k)}[\varphi]\subset\Delta_k(\mathscr{M})$ *for all $k\geq 2$, $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$.*

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$) for any $k\geq 2$, assume that in the support of $F^{(k)}[\varphi]$ there are two points $x_i\neq x_j$. Then, there exist two smooth functions ψ_i,ψ_j such that $x_i\in\operatorname{supp}\psi_i$, $x_j\in\operatorname{supp}\psi_j$ and $\operatorname{supp}\psi_i\cap\operatorname{supp}\psi_j=\varnothing$. By additivity we split the right-hand side of the formula for $F^{(k)}$ in Definition 2.3.7 according to the supports of ψ_i and ψ_j, but the derivatives act always on all λ_j's, hence we get zero. In particular, the last assertion holds.

($\Rightarrow$) Assume that $\psi_1,\psi_2\in\mathscr{V}\subset\mathscr{U}-\varphi$ are such that $\operatorname{supp}\psi_1\cap\operatorname{supp}\psi_2=\varnothing$, where $\mathscr{V}$ is an absolutely convex open neighborhood of zero. Using the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99), we write

$$F_\varphi(\psi_1+\psi_2)=F_\varphi(\psi_1)+\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda\ \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\ F_\varphi(\psi_1+\lambda\psi_2)\ .$$

The integral in the right hand side can be rewritten as

$$\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda\ \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\ F_\varphi(\psi_1+\lambda\psi_2)=F_\varphi(\psi_2)+\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda\ \int_0^1\mathrm{d}\mu\ F^{(2)}[\mu\psi_1+\lambda\psi_2+\varphi](\psi_1,\psi_2)\ .$$

By locality, $F^{(2)}[\mu\psi_1+\lambda\psi_2+\varphi]$ is supported in $\Delta_2(\mathscr{M})$, but by our initial assumption $\operatorname{supp}\psi_1\cap\operatorname{supp}\psi_2=\varnothing$, hence (13) and the last assertion of the Proposition hold. □

For *microlocal* functionals there is a refinement of Proposition 2.3.11 which identifies this class of functionals with the kind of local functionals usually employed by physicists, such as (22) and (23). We build over the argument sketched in the proof of Theorem 2 of [12], with a few changes.

2.3.12. PROPOSITION. *Let* $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *be convex and open in the compact-open topology,* $\varphi_0\in\mathscr{U}$*, and* $F\in\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ *be smooth. Then* F *is microlocal if and only if there is a smooth d-form* ω_{F,φ_0} *on* $J^\infty(\mathscr{M},\mathbb{R})$ *such that its pullback* $(j^\infty\varphi)^*\omega_{F,\varphi_0}$ *by the infinite jet prolongation* $j^\infty\varphi$ *of any* $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$ *is a smooth d-form of compact support on* $\mathscr{M}$*, and*

$$F(\varphi)=F(\varphi_0)+\int_{\mathscr{M}}(j^\infty\varphi)^*\omega_{F,\varphi_0}\ . \tag{25}$$

Moreover, ω_{F,φ_0} *depends on infinite-order jets in the sense that for each* $p\in\mathscr{M}$ *there is a* $r\in\mathbb{N}$ *such that if* $\varphi_1,\varphi_2\in\mathscr{U}$ *are such that* $j^r\varphi_1(p)=j^r\varphi_2(p)$*, then* $((j^\infty\varphi_1)^*\omega_{F,\varphi_0})(p)=((j^\infty\varphi_2)^*\omega_{F,\varphi_0})(p)$*.*

Proof. Smooth functionals with compact space-time support that satisfy the representation formula (25) with ω_{F,φ_0} as above are obviously microlocal, so we are only left with proving the opposite implication. Since $\mathscr{U}$ is assumed convex, the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99) yields

$$F(\varphi)=F(\varphi_0)+\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda F^{(1)}[\varphi_0+\lambda\varphi'](\varphi')=F(\varphi_0)+\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda\int_{\mathscr{M}}\varphi' E(F)[\varphi_0+\lambda\varphi']\ ,$$

where $\varphi'=\varphi-\varphi_0$ and $E(F)[\psi]$ is the smooth density of compact support that represents $F^{(1)}[\psi]$. Therefore,

$$p\mapsto F_p(\varphi)\doteq\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda(\varphi(p)-\varphi_0(p))E(F)[\varphi_0+\lambda(\varphi-\varphi_0)](p)$$

is our candidate for the density $(j^\infty\varphi)^*\omega_{F,\varphi_0}$, which we will identify with a smooth function by a choice of a volume element on a neighborhood of $\operatorname{supp}F$, when needed. Take now $\varphi_1,\varphi_2\in\mathscr{V}$ such that $\varphi_1+\varphi_2\in\mathscr{V}$ and $\varphi_1-\varphi_2$ vanishes together with all its partial derivatives in some (hence, any) coordinate chart at some $p\in\mathscr{M}$ (the first condition can always be achieved by multiplying $\varphi_1,\varphi_2\in\mathscr{V}$ by a suitably small constant – this operation does not modify the second condition). Applying the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99) once more, together with the Fubini-Tonelli theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned}F_p(\varphi_0+\varphi_2)-F_p(\varphi_0+\varphi_1)&=\\&=\varphi_1(p)\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\lambda\,(E(F)[\varphi_0+\lambda\varphi_2](p)-E(F)[\varphi_0+\lambda\varphi_1](p))\\&=\varphi_1(p)\int_0^1\lambda\mathrm{d}\lambda\int_0^1\mathrm{d}\mu E(F)^{(1)}[\varphi_0+\lambda(\varphi_1+\mu(\varphi_2-\varphi_1))](\varphi_2-\varphi_1)(p)\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where we have also made use of the fact that $\varphi_1(p) = \varphi_2(p)$. However, for each $\psi_1, \psi_2 \in \mathscr{V}$ such that $\psi_1 + \psi_2 \in \mathscr{V}$, the linear map

$$\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \ni \vec{\varphi} \mapsto \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}\lambda \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}\mu E(F)^{(1)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda(\psi_1 + \mu\psi_2)](\vec{\varphi}) \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$$

decreases supports, for the integrand in the right hand side coincides with $F^{(2)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda(\psi_1 + \mu\psi_2)](\vec{\varphi}, \cdot)$ in the sense of distributions and F is local. By Peetre's theorem [62], the above linear map must be a linear differential operator of order r' with smooth coefficients supported in $\operatorname{supp} F$ for some $r' \in \mathbb{N}$ depending on ψ. Since we have assumed that φ_1 and φ_2 coincide up to infinite order at p, it turns out that

$$\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}\lambda\varphi_1(p)E(F)[\varphi_0 + \lambda\varphi_1](p) = \int_0^1 \mathrm{d}\lambda\varphi_2(p)E(F)[\varphi_0 + \lambda\varphi_2](p) \ ,$$

hence proving the first assertion. Moreover, since $F^{(2)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda(\psi_1 + \mu\psi_2)](\varphi, \cdot)$ is a distribution supported in $\operatorname{supp} F$, it must be of finite order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ (say), hence we may require that φ_1 and φ_2 coincide only up to order r at p, thus proving the second assertion. $\square$

2.3.13. Remark. A natural question at this point is whether the density determined by a microlocal functional F is of *finite order* $r \geq 0$, that is, it depends only on a finite, *φ-independent* number r of derivatives of the field configuration φ at each point of $\mathscr{M}$, so that (25) reduces to the form (22). Obviously, this is equivalent to the same question posed for the smooth density $E(F)[\varphi]$ representing $F^{(1)}[\varphi]$. It follows from Lemma 2.3.5 and the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99) that a necessary condition for $E(F)[\varphi]$ to be of globally finite order (say) $r \in \mathbb{N}$ is that for every $R \geq 0$ there is a $C > 0$ such that the Lipschitz estimate

$$\|{*_g}E(F)[\varphi_2] - {*_g}E(F)[\varphi_1]\|_{\infty,0,\operatorname{supp} F} \leq C\|\varphi_2 - \varphi_1\|_{\infty,r,\operatorname{supp} F} \tag{26}$$

holds for every $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathscr{U}$ such that $\|\varphi_1 - \varphi_2\|_{\infty,r,\operatorname{supp} F} < R$, where $*_g$ is the Hodge star operator associated to the metric g. It follows from Lemma 2.2.3 that if $\mathscr{U}$ is such that for every $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$ there is a $\delta > 0$ such that $\{\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) : \|\varphi - \varphi_0\|_{\infty,r,\operatorname{supp} F} < \delta\} \subset \mathscr{U}$, then these estimates are also sufficient (see Proposition 5 and Theorem 1 in [79]).

We close this Section with a few comments on the algebraic structure of the spaces of local and microlocal functionals. As we have seen, in spite of the nice structure of its elements, $\mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ and $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ are not closed under pointwise products. However, the dynamical developments in the next Section will lead, for each $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ open in the compact-open topology, to a space of functionals which includes both $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ and $\mathscr{F}_0(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ and is not only closed under products, but will also be shown later to possess good topological properties (see Section 4).

3. Off-shell linearized dynamics

Unlike the standard approaches to classical field theory, we will not attempt to impose equations of motion directly to field configurations, but instead we do this algebraically by studying the effect of dynamics on observable quantities. More precisely, in this Section we want to describe how *perturbing* a given dynamics affects observables. On an infinitesimal level, this corresponds to endowing a sufficiently large space of observables with a Poisson structure associated to this dynamics, which will be introduced in Subsection 3.2.

3.1. **Preliminaries. Generalized Lagrangians and the Euler-Lagrange derivative.**

Our approach to dynamics is based on a local variational principle of Euler-Lagrange type. In order to formulate it in our context, first we need to make the representation formula for microlocal functionals provided by Proposition 2.3.12 more flexible by allowing the support of the functional to be prescribed at will. This is accomplished by the following concept, introduced in a slightly different form by Definition 6.1 of [12] (see also the footnote preceding Lemma 3.1.3 below).

3.1.1. DEFINITION. Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. A *generalized Lagrangian* $\mathscr{L}$ on $\mathscr{U}$ is a map

$$\mathscr{L}:\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})\to\mathscr{F}_{00}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})\ ,$$

such that the following properties hold:

(1) $\operatorname{supp}(\mathscr{L}(f))\subset\operatorname{supp}f$;
(2) $\mathscr{L}(f_1+f_2+f_3)=\mathscr{L}(f_1+f_2)-\mathscr{L}(f_2)+\mathscr{L}(f_2+f_3)$, if $\operatorname{supp}f_1\cap\operatorname{supp}f_3=\varnothing$.

We call the argument f of $\mathscr{L}(f)$ its *support function.* We say that $\mathscr{L}$ is *smooth* if $\mathscr{L}(f)$ is smooth for all $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$.

In other words, a generalized Lagrangian is additive *with respect to support functions.* As with the case with additive functionals, one can work instead with *relative* generalized Lagrangians $\mathscr{L}_{f_0}$ with respect to $f_0\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, given by

$$\mathscr{L}_{f_0}(f)\doteq\mathscr{L}(f_0+f)-\mathscr{L}(f_0)\ ,$$

in terms of which the additivity property with respect to support functions reads, for all $f_1,f_2,f_3\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ such that $\operatorname{supp}f_1\cap\operatorname{supp}f_3=\varnothing$,

$$\mathscr{L}_{f_2}(f_1+f_3)=\mathscr{L}_{f_2}(f_1)+\mathscr{L}_{f_2}(f_3)\ .$$

Moreover, one has the follwing result, extracted from the proof of Proposition 6.2 of [12].

3.1.2. LEMMA. *Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a generalized Lagrangian. Then $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{L}_{f_0}(f)\subset\operatorname{supp}f$, for all $f,f_0\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$.*

Proof. Let $p\notin\operatorname{supp}f$, and choose $f_0'\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ such that $f_0'\equiv f_0$ in a neighborhood of p and $\operatorname{supp}f\cap\operatorname{supp}f_0'=\varnothing$. By additivity of $\mathscr{L}$ with respect to support functions, we have that $\mathscr{L}_{f_0}(f)=\mathscr{L}_{f_0-f_0'}(f)$, which implies that $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{L}_{f_0}(f)\subset\operatorname{supp}(f+f_0-f_0')\cup\operatorname{supp}(f_0-f_0')$. Therefore, $p\notin\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{L}_{f_0}(f)$, as asserted. □

Additivity with respect to support functions is a weak substitute for linearity, but is strong enough to yield useful consequences. One of them is that the argument involving field configurations inherits this property[4]:

---

[4] This property is assumed *a priori* in Definition 6.1 of [12].

3.1.3. Lemma. *Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, and $\mathscr{L}$ a generalized Lagrangian on $\mathscr{U}$. Then, for all $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, $\mathscr{L}(f)$ is additive.*

Proof. Fix an arbitrary $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, and let $\varphi_2 \in \mathscr{U}$, $\varphi_1, \varphi_3 \in \mathscr{U} - \varphi_2$ be such that $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\varphi_3 = \varnothing$. Let $\chi_1, \chi_3 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be such that $\chi_j \equiv 1$ in a neighborhood of $\operatorname{supp}\varphi_j$, $j = 1, 3$, and $\operatorname{supp}\chi_1 \cap \operatorname{supp}\chi_3 = \varnothing$. Define $f_1 \doteq \chi_1 f$, $f_3 \doteq \chi_3 f$, and $f_2 \doteq f - f_1 - f_3$. Then, by properties (1) and (2) in Definition 3.1.1,

$$\mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3) = \mathscr{L}(f_1 + f_2)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f_2)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f_2 + f_3)(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3) \ .$$

However, we also have that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) &= \mathscr{L}(f_1 + f_2)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f_2)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f_2 + f_3)(\varphi_2) \ , \\ \mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_2) &= \mathscr{L}(f_1 + f_2)(\varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f_2)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f_2 + f_3)(\varphi_2) \ , \\ \mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3) &= \mathscr{L}(f_1 + f_2)(\varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f_2)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f_2 + f_3)(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

whence it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3) \\ &\qquad = \mathscr{L}(f_1 + f_2)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) - \mathscr{L}(f_2)(\varphi_2) + \mathscr{L}(f_2 + f_3)(\varphi_2 + \varphi_3) \\ &\qquad = \mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2 + \varphi_3) \ ,\end{aligned}$$

which proves our assertion. ☐

3.1.4. Corollary. *Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open with respect to the compact-open topology, and $\mathscr{L}$ be a* smooth *generalized Lagrangian on $\mathscr{U}$. Then $\mathscr{L}(f) \in \mathscr{F}_{\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ for all $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$.*

Proof. Apply Proposition 2.3.11 to the outcome of Lemma 3.1.3. ☐

Another consequence is the following generalization of Lemma 2.3.5 to *any* open subset of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$:

3.1.5. Lemma. *Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, and $\mathscr{L}$ be a generalized Lagrangian on $\mathscr{U}$. Then, for any $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ fixed, $\mathscr{L}(f)$ can be written as a finite sum of additive functionals of arbitrarily small space-time support.*

Proof. Let $(\chi_i)_{i=1,\ldots,n}$ a the partition of unity subordinated to the finite open covering of $\operatorname{supp} f$ constructed in the proof of Lemma 2.3.5. Then

$$\mathscr{L}(f) = \mathscr{L}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} \chi_i f\right) \ .$$

Applying additivity of $\mathscr{L}$ with respect to support functions just as we did in the proof of Lemma 2.3.5 yields the desired result. ☐

Lemma 3.1.5 will be refined even further in the third paper of this series.

Motivated by Corollary 3.1.4, we say that a generalized Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ is *microlocal* if $\mathscr{L}(f) \in \mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$ for all $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, and *of (finite) order* $r \geq 0$ if, in addition, $\mathscr{L}(f)$ is of finite order $r \in \mathbb{N}$ for all such f. A simple but important example of microlocal generalized Lagrangians of order r are the squares of local Sobolev seminorms (5) at order $k = r$

$$\mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi) = \|\varphi\|^2_{2,r,f} \ . \tag{27}$$

With the concept of microlocal generalized Lagrangian at hand, we can write down the Euler-Lagrange variational principle in the form we will use.

3.1.6. DEFINITION. Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology, $\mathscr{L}$ a smooth generalized Lagrangian, $k \geq 1$. The k-th order *Euler-Lagrange derivative* of $\mathscr{L}$ at $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ along $\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is given by

$$D^k\mathscr{L}(1)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k) = D^k\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k) \ ,$$

where $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ satisfies $f \equiv 1$ on $\operatorname{supp} \varphi_j$ for at least one $j = 1, \ldots, k$ (due to Lemma 3.1.2, the above definition is independent of the choice of f). If $\mathscr{L}$ is microlocal of finite order and $\operatorname{supp} \vec{\varphi}_1$ is compact, we have that for $k = 1$,

$$D\mathscr{L}(1)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1) = \langle E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi], \vec{\varphi}_1\rangle$$

defines a partial differential operator $E(\mathscr{L}) : \mathscr{U} \to \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$, called the *Euler-Lagrange operator* associated to $\mathscr{L}$. The map $E(\mathscr{L})$ is clearly smooth, with derivatives of order $k \geq 1$ at $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ along $\vec{\varphi}_2, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k+1} \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ given by the identity

$$\int_{\mathscr{M}} \vec{\varphi}_1 D^k E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_2, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k+1}) = D^k\mathscr{L}(1)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \vec{\varphi}_2, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k+1}) \ .$$

For $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ fixed, the maps $D^k E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] : \otimes^k\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$ are (symmetric) k-linear k-differential operators (i.e. for each $j = 2, \ldots, k+1$, $D^k E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_2, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_j, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k+1})$ is a linear partial differential operator acting on $\vec{\varphi}_j$ with all other arguments fixed). We call

$$E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] = DE(\mathscr{L})[\varphi]$$

the *linearized Euler-Lagrange operator* around $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$.

Definition 3.1.6 prompts us to compare it with the standard formulation of the Euler-Lagrange variational principle in field theory [48]. We sketch this comparison below. Our definition of Euler-Lagrange derivatives is tailored to get rid of boundary terms automatically; to make them appear, let $\mathscr{L}(f)$ be a microlocal generalized Lagrangian which depends *linearly* on the supporting function f. It follows from Peetre's theorem [62] that $D\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi]$ is a linear partial differential operator acting on f for each fixed φ, taking values on $\Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$. Let now f converge to the characteristic function χ_K of a compact region K of $\mathscr{M}$ with smooth boundary ∂K – the part of $D\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi})$ proportional to the term of zeroth order in f yields

$$\int_K \vec{\varphi}_1 E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] \ ,$$

and the remaining terms become the integral over ∂K of the Poincaré-Cartan $(d-1)$-form $\Theta[\varphi]$ associated to the action integral $\mathscr{L}(\chi_K)$ over K. If $\mathscr{L}$ is of order r, one can show [48] that $E(\mathscr{L})$ has order at most $2r$. Therefore, Definition 3.1.6 does provide a generalization of the Euler-Lagrange variational principle.

The role of Lagrangians which are total divergences in our setup is played by the following

3.1.7. Definition. Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. A generalized Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ on $\mathscr{U}$ is said to be *trivial* if $\operatorname{supp}\mathscr{L}(f)\subset\operatorname{supp}(\mathrm{d}f)$ for all $f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. Two generalized Lagrangians $\mathscr{L}_1,\mathscr{L}_2$ are said to be *equivalent* if $(\mathscr{L}_1-\mathscr{L}_2)(f)\doteq\mathscr{L}_1(f)-\mathscr{L}_2(f)$ is trivial. This is clearly an equivalence relation in the space of all generalized Lagrangians. If $\mathscr{U}$ is open in the compact-open topology and $\mathscr{L}$ is a microlocal generalized Lagrangian of order r, its equivalence class $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ in the space of all microlocal generalized Lagrangians of order r is called an *action functional of order* r.

Trivial generalized Lagrangians are thus called because they obviously have vanishing Euler-Lagrange derivatives of all orders whenever they are defined. Therefore, two equivalent generalized Lagrangians have the same Euler-Lagrange derivatives. In particular, the action functional $S_{\mathscr{L}}$ associated to a microlocal generalized Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ of finite order uniquely determines the Euler-Lagrange operator $E(\mathscr{L})$.

Let $\mathscr{L}$ be a trivial, microlocal generalized Lagrangian of finite order, such that $\mathscr{L}(f)$ is linear in the supporting function f. The reasoning preceding Definition 3.1.7 shows that $D\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi]$ can be written as

$$D\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi]=\Theta[\varphi]\wedge\mathrm{d}f+\mathrm{d}\Xi(f)[\varphi]\ ,$$

where $\Xi(f)[\varphi]$ is a smooth $(d-1)$-form supported in $\operatorname{supp}f$. Making f converge to χ_K as above shows that $D\mathscr{L}(f)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi})$ converges to the integral of $\Theta[\varphi]$ over ∂K alone.

3.2. Normally hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange operators. Infinitesimal solvability and the Peierls bracket.

As discussed in the Introduction, we are mainly interested in relativistic classical field theories. This means that the action functional determining the dynamics must give rise to Euler-Lagrange equations of motion which are *hyperbolic*. There are several different concepts of hyperbolicity for partial differential operators (see for instance [19]); the one we use is the notion of *normal hyperbolicity*, as defined for instance in [3] for linear partial differential operators. For later convenience (cf. the energy estimates in the second paper of the series), the discussion in the linear case takes place in the context of smooth sections of vector bundles.

3.2.1. Definition. Let $\pi:\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M}$ be a real vector bundle of rank D over the space-time manifold $\mathscr{M}$. A linear partial differential operator of second order $P:\Gamma^\infty(\pi)\to\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ acting on $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ is said to be *normally hyperbolic* if its principal symbol $\hat{p}\in\Gamma^\infty(\vee^2T\mathscr{M}\otimes\mathscr{E}'\otimes\mathscr{E}\to\mathscr{M})$, given by

$$\lim_{\lambda\to\infty}\lambda^{-2}e^{-\lambda f}P(e^{\lambda f}\vec{\varphi})(x)\doteq\hat{p}(x,\mathrm{d}f(x))\vec{\varphi}(x)\ ,$$

$(f\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}),\vec{\varphi}\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi))$ is of the form

$$\hat{p}(x,\xi)=\hat{g}^{-1}(x)(\xi,\xi)\otimes\mathbb{1}_{\pi^{-1}(x)}\ ,\quad x\in\mathscr{M}\ ,\ \xi\in T^*_x\mathscr{M}\ ,$$

where $\hat{g}$ is a Lorentzian metric on $\mathscr{M}$.

We remark that a linear partial differential operator P is normally hyperbolic if and only if P is regularly hyperbolic in the sense of Christodoulou [19] and has a scalar principal symbol.

Any second-order linear partial differential operator $P : \Gamma^\infty(\pi) \to \Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ can be written in a coordinate-invariant fashion as follows. If we define iterated covariant derivatives of smooth sections of π with respect to some connection ∇ (see Remark 2.2.1), P assumes the form

$$P\vec{\varphi} = \hat{p}\nabla^2\vec{\varphi} + A\nabla\vec{\varphi} + B\vec{\varphi}\ , \tag{28}$$

where $A \in \Gamma^\infty(T\mathscr{M} \otimes \mathscr{E}' \otimes \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{M})$, $B \in \Gamma^\infty(\mathscr{E}' \times \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{M})$ and $\hat{p} \in \Gamma^\infty(\vee^2 T\mathscr{M} \otimes \mathscr{E}' \otimes \mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{M})$ is the principal symbol. We remark that, unlike A and B, $\hat{p}$ is independent of the choice of ∇.

Before we continue, we introduce a strict partial order $<$ and a partial order $\lesssim$ in the space $\mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$ of continuous Lorentzian metrics on $\mathscr{M}$. Let $g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$; we say that

$$\begin{aligned} g_1 < g_2 \quad &\text{if} \quad g_1(X,X) \leq 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad g_2(X,X) < 0\ ;\\ g_1 \lesssim g_2 \quad &\text{if} \quad g_1(X,X) < 0 \quad \text{implies} \quad g_2(X,X) < 0\ , \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

for all $X \in T\mathscr{M}$. As usual, we write $g_1 > g_2$ (resp. $g_1 \gtrsim g_2$) if $g_2 < g_1$ (resp. $g_2 \lesssim g_1$). By continuity, $g_1 \lesssim g_2$ implies that $g_2(X,X) \leq 0$ for all X such that $g_1(X,X) \leq 0$ (the converse is not necessarily true). Both partial orders clearly enjoy the property that if $g_1 < g_2$ (resp. $g_1 \lesssim g_2$), then $\Omega_1 g_1 < \Omega_2 g_2$ (resp. $\Omega_1 g_1 \lesssim \Omega_2 g_2$) for all positive, real-valued continuous functions Ω_1, Ω_2 on $\mathscr{M}$. In other words, $<$ and $\lesssim$ depend only on the conformal classes (hence, only on the causal structures) of g_1 and g_2. As shown by Lerner [52], the order topology on $\mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$ associated to $<$ (i.e. the topology generated by the open intervals $\{g | g_1 < g < g_2\}$ as g_1, g_2 run through $\mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$), called the *interval topology* on $\mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$, coincides with the latter's relative graph (Whitney) topology. Moreover, Geroch has shown (Theorem 12, pp. 448–449 in [33]) that, given g globally hyperbolic, there is $g_2 > g$ such that g_2 is also globally hyperbolic. We shall use this fact to prove the following useful result:

3.2.2. LEMMA. *The space of continuous, time-oriented and globally hyperbolic Lorentzian metrics on $\mathscr{M}$ is an open subset of $\mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$ in the interval topology (hence also in the Whitney topology). Moreover, given any such metric g_2, all $g_1 \in \mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$ such that $g_1 \lesssim g_2$ are also globally hyperbolic and have the same time orientation as g_2, and any Cauchy time function with respect to g_2 is also a Cauchy time function with respect to g_1.*

Proof. Notice that if $g_1 \lesssim g_2$ and g_2 is globally hyperbolic, then any Cauchy hypersurface in $\mathscr{M}$ with respect to g_2 is also a Cauchy hypersurface with respect to g_1, therefore g_1 is globally hyperbolic as well. The results of Lerner and Geroch quoted above then imply that any globally hyperbolic g is contained in the open interval $\{g' | g_1 < g' < g_2\}$ for some pair $g_1, g_2 \in \mathrm{Lor}^0(\mathscr{M})$ such that g_2 is also globally hyperbolic. By the above reasoning, any g' in this set is globally hyperbolic as well. In particular, if τ is a Cauchy time function on $\mathscr{M}$ with respect to g_2, then τ is also a Cauchy time function with respect to any $g_1 \lesssim g_2$ – notice that (29) implies that if the tangent vector X is spacelike with respect to g_2, then it is also spacelike with respect to g_1; therefore $\mathrm{d}\tau$ is a timelike covector field with respect to g_1, since it is normal to the tangent bundle of all level sets of τ, whose elements must be all spacelike with respect to g_1. Finally, if $T_1 = g_1^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\tau)$ and $T_2 = g_2^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\tau)$, where $g_1 \lesssim g_2$ are time oriented and τ is a Cauchy time function with respect to g_2, then $g_1(T_1, T_2) = \mathrm{d}\tau(T_2) = g_2(T_2, T_2) < 0$ and $g_2(T_1, T_2) = \mathrm{d}\tau(T_1) =$

$g_1(T_1,T_1) < 0$. In particular, if T_1 is future directed with respect to g_1, then it is also future directed with respect to g_2. □

Lemma 3.2.2 and its proof obviously extend to smooth metrics. Let now P be a normally hyperbolic linear partial differential operator on $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$. We assume the *working hypothesis* (NH_g) on P, given as follows:

(NH_g) The Lorentzian metric $\hat{g}$ on $\mathscr{M}$ associated to the principal symbol $\hat{p}$ of P satisfies $\hat{g} \lesssim g$.

By the above discussion, all such $\hat{g}$'s are globally hyperbolic and have the same time orientation as g. Moreover, by Lemma 3.2.2 these implications of (NH_g) are stable under perturbations of $\hat{g}$ in the interval topology, a fact that will be useful in the nonlinear case.

For P normally hyperbolic and satisfying (NH_g), one can prove the following fact, which is a restatement of results in [3] which can also be proven using the energy estimates in the second paper of this series.

3.2.3. THEOREM. *Let $(\mathscr{M},g)$ be a globally hyperbolic space-time, and $\mathscr{E} \to \mathscr{M}$ be a real vector bundle of rank D over the space-time manifold $\mathscr{M}$, endowed with a connection ∇. We assume that $T\mathscr{M}$ is endowed with the Levi-Civita connection associated to the space-time metric g. Let P be a normally hyperbolic linear partial differential operator on $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ satisftying (NH_g). Let Σ be a Cauchy hypersurface for $(\mathscr{M},g)$, with future directed timelike normal $n \in \Gamma^\infty(T_\Sigma\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$ (i.e. $g(n,n) = -1$ and $g(n,X) = 0$ for all $X \in T\Sigma$), suitably extended to an open neighborhood of Σ in $\mathscr{M}$ (the exact form of the extension is irrelevant for what follows). Given $\vec{\varphi} \in \Gamma^\infty(\pi)$, define*

$$\rho_0^\Sigma(\vec{\varphi}) = \vec{\varphi}|_\Sigma \ , \tag{30}$$

$$\rho_1^\Sigma(\vec{\varphi}) = (\nabla_n\vec{\varphi})|_\Sigma \ . \tag{31}$$

Then for every $\vec{\varphi}_0, \vec{\varphi}_1 \in \Gamma^\infty(\pi|_\Sigma)$, $\psi \in \Gamma^\infty(\pi)$, there is a unique $\vec{\varphi} \in \Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} P\vec{\varphi} &= \vec{\psi} \ , \\ \rho_j^\Sigma(\vec{\varphi}) &= \vec{\varphi}_j \ , \quad j = 0,1 \ . \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

In other words, the map $\Phi : \Gamma^\infty(\pi) \to \Gamma^\infty(\pi) \oplus \Gamma^\infty(\pi|_\Sigma) \oplus \Gamma^\infty(\pi|_\Sigma)$ given by

$$\Phi(\vec{\varphi}) = (P\vec{\varphi}, \rho_0^\Sigma(\vec{\varphi}), \rho_1^\Sigma(\vec{\varphi})) \tag{33}$$

is a linear isomorphism. □

We stress that Φ is even a *topological* linear isomorphism with respect to the standard Fréchet space topology on spaces of smooth sections of vector bundles: continuity of $\vec{\varphi}$ is obvious, whereas continuity of its inverse follows from the energy estimates to appear in the second paper of this series.

Let Ψ be the inverse of Φ. By the principle of superposition, one can write

$$\Psi(\vec{\psi}, \vec{\varphi}_0, \vec{\varphi}_1) = K_P^{\Sigma,0}\vec{\varphi}_0 + K_P^{\Sigma,1}\vec{\varphi}_1 + \Delta_P^\Sigma\vec{\psi} \ , \tag{34}$$

where $K^{\Sigma,j}_P\vec{\varphi}_j$, $j=0,1$ is the unique solution of the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} P\vec{\varphi} & = 0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_{1-j}(\vec{\varphi}) & = 0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_j(\vec{\varphi}) & = \vec{\varphi}_j\ , \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

and $\Delta^\Sigma_P\vec{\psi}$ is the unique solution of the initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} P\vec{\varphi} & = \vec{\psi}\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_0(\vec{\varphi}) & = 0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_1(\vec{\varphi}) & = 0\ . \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

In the scalar case, there is the following refinement of Theorem 3.2.3, which is a restatement of Theorem 5.1.6 of [26] that, on its turn, tells us in great detail how supports and singularities propagate under the dynamics associated to P.

3.2.4. THEOREM. *Assume the hypotheses and definitions of Theorem 3.2.3. Suppose that* $\mathscr{E}=\mathscr{M}\times\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\pi(p,\lambda)=\mathrm{pr}_1(p,\lambda)=p$ *for* $p\in\mathscr{M}$, $\lambda\in\mathbb{R}$, *identifying* $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ *with* $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. *Then* $\Delta^\Sigma_P:\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})\to\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, $K^{\Sigma,0}_P:\mathscr{C}^\infty(\Sigma)\to\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *and* $K^{\Sigma,1}_P:\mathscr{C}^\infty(\Sigma)\to\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *satisfy the following properties:*

(a) *Continuity:* $K^{\Sigma,j}_P$ *is a (continuous) linear map which admits a continuous linear extension to the space* $\mathscr{D}'(\Sigma)$ *of distributions on* Σ *for* $j=0,1$, *and* Δ^Σ_P *is a (continuous) linear map which admits a continuous linear extension to*

$$\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})=\{v\in\mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})|\mathrm{WF}(v)\cap N^*\Sigma=\varnothing\}\ , \tag{37}$$

where $\mathrm{WF}(v)$ *denotes the wave front set of* v *and* $N^*\Sigma=\{\xi\in T_\Sigma\mathscr{M}|\xi(X)=0$ *for all* $X\in T\Sigma\}$ *denotes the conormal bundle of* Σ. *We remark that the continuous linear maps* $\rho^\Sigma_j:\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})\to\mathscr{C}^\infty(\Sigma)$ *also admit a continuous linear extension to* $\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})\ni v$, *satisfying for* $j=0,1$ [39]

$$\mathrm{WF}(\rho^\Sigma_j(v))=\{(x,\xi|_{T\Sigma})\in T^*\Sigma|(x,\xi)\in\mathrm{WF}(v)\}\ . \tag{38}$$

(b) *Propagation of supports:*

$$\mathrm{supp}\,(K^{\Sigma,j}_P u_j)\subset J^+(\mathrm{supp}\,u_j,\hat{g})\cup J^-(\mathrm{supp}\,u_j,\hat{g})\subset J^+(\mathrm{supp}\,u_j,g)\cup J^-(\mathrm{supp}\,u_j,g) \tag{39}$$

and

$$\mathrm{supp}\,(\Delta^\Sigma_P v)\subset J^+(\mathrm{supp}\,v\cap J^+(\Sigma,\hat{g}),\hat{g})\cup J^-(\mathrm{supp}\,v\cap J^-(\Sigma,\hat{g}),\hat{g})\ , \tag{40}$$

for all $u_j\in\mathscr{D}'(\Sigma)$, $v\in\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$, $j=0,1$.

(c) *Propagation of singularities: given any* $u_j\in\mathscr{D}'(\Sigma)$, $j=0,1$, *we have that* $(x,\xi)\in\mathrm{WF}(K^{\Sigma,j}_P u_j)$ *if and only if there is* $\lambda>0$ *and a null geodesic segment* $\gamma:[0,\Lambda]\to\mathscr{M}$ *with respect to* $\hat{g}$ *(i.e.* $\hat{g}(\dot\gamma(\lambda),\dot\gamma(\lambda))=0$ *for all* $\lambda\in[0,\Lambda]$*) such that if*

$$E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma=\{(\gamma(0),\hat{g}^\flat(\dot\gamma(0))),(\gamma(\Lambda),\hat{g}^\flat(\dot\gamma(\Lambda)))\}\subset T^*\mathscr{M}$$

is the set of endpoints of the bicharacterstic strip $\{(\gamma(\lambda),\hat{g}^\flat(\dot\gamma(\lambda)))\in T^*\mathscr{M}|\lambda\in[0,\Lambda]\}$, *then* $(x',\xi'|_{T\Sigma})\in\mathrm{WF}(u_j)$ *for some* $(x',\xi')\in E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma$ *and* $(x,\xi)\in E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma$*. Given any* $v\in\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$, *we have that* $(x,\xi)\in\mathrm{WF}(\Delta^\Sigma_P v)$ *if and only if either* $(x,\xi)\in\mathrm{WF}(v)$ *or there is* $\Lambda>0$ *and a null geodesic segment* $\gamma:[0,\Lambda]\to\mathscr{M}$ *with respect to* $\hat{g}$ *such that* $\gamma(\lambda)\notin\Sigma$ *for all* $\lambda\in(0,\Lambda)$ *and such that* $\mathrm{WF}(v)\cap E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma\neq\varnothing$ *and* $(x,\xi)\in E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma$.

In particular, given any $u_0,u_1\in\mathscr{D}'(\Sigma)$, $v\in\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$, *we have that* $K^{\Sigma,j}_P u_j$ *and* $\Delta^\Sigma_P u_j$ *belong to* $\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$. *We have that* $u=K^{\Sigma,j}_P u_j$, $j=0,1$ *is the unique solution in* $\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$ *of the initial value problem*

$$\begin{cases} Pu & =0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_{1-j}(u) & =0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_j(u) & =u_j\ , \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

and $u=\Delta^\Sigma_P v$ *is the unique solution in* $\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$ *of the initial value problem*

$$\begin{cases} Pu & =v\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_0(v) & =0\ , \\ \rho^\Sigma_1(v) & =0\ . \end{cases} \tag{42}$$

□

We note that part (b) of Theorem 3.2.4 is actually stronger than that provided by Theorem 5.1.6 of [26], but it can also be derived from the energy estimates obtained in the second paper of this series.

There are two particular cases of the initial value problem (36) that deserve special attention:

- $\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\subset I^+(\Sigma,g)$ – In this case, Δ^Σ_P admits a unique linear extension to the space of smooth sections of $\mathscr{E}$ with *past compact* support with respect to g
$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^\infty_+(\pi,g)&=\{\vec{\psi}\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)|\forall p\in\mathscr{M},J^-(p,g)\cap\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\text{ is compact}\}\\ &=\{\vec{\psi}\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)|\forall K\subset\mathscr{M}\text{ compact},J^-(K,g)\cap\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\text{ is compact}\}\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{43}$$
which no longer depends on Σ. In this case we write $\Delta^\Sigma_P=\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P$, calling it the *retarded fundamental solution* of P.
- $\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\subset I^-(\Sigma,g)$ – In this case, Δ^Σ_P admits a unique linear extension to the space of smooth sections of $\mathscr{E}$ with *future compact* support with respect to g
$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^\infty_-(\pi,g)&=\{\vec{\psi}\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)|\forall p\in\mathscr{M},J^+(p,g)\cap\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\text{ is compact}\}\\ &=\{\vec{\psi}\in\Gamma^\infty(\pi)|\forall K\subset\mathscr{M}\text{ compact},\ J^+(K,g)\cap\operatorname{supp}\vec{\psi}\text{ is compact}\}\ ,\end{aligned}\tag{44}$$
which no longer depends on Σ either. In this case we write $\Delta^\Sigma_P=\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P$, calling it the *advanced fundamental solution* of P.

The difference $\Delta_P=\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P-\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P:\Gamma^\infty_+(\pi,g)\cap\Gamma^\infty_-(\pi,g)\to\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ is called the *causal propagator* of P. We obviously have the identity $P\circ\Delta_P=\Delta_P\circ P=0$ in the domain of Δ_P.

In the scalar case discussed in Theorem 3.2.4, Δ_P^{ret} (resp. Δ_P^{adv}) is defined on the space of smooth functions on $\mathscr{M}$ with past (resp. future) compact support with respect to g

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{C}^\infty_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g) &= \{\psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) | \forall p \in \mathscr{M}, J^{-/+}(p,g) \cap \operatorname{supp}\psi \text{ is compact}\} \\ &= \{\psi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) | \forall K \subset \mathscr{M} \text{ compact}, J^{-/+}(K,g) \cap \operatorname{supp}\psi \text{ is compact}\} . \end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

Specializing Theorem 3.2.4 to these two cases yields the

3.2.5. Corollary. *Let the hypotheses and notation of Theorem 3.2.4 be satisfied. Then* Δ_P^{ret} *and* Δ_P^{adv} *satisfy the following properties:*

(a) *Continuity:* Δ_P^{ret} *(resp.* Δ_P^{adv}*) admits a continuous extension to the space of distributions on* $\mathscr{M}$ *with past (resp. future) compact support with respect to* g

$$\begin{aligned} \mathscr{D}'_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g) &= \{v \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M}) | \forall p \in \mathscr{M}, J^{-/+}(p,g) \cap \operatorname{supp}\psi \textit{ is compact}\} \\ &= \{v \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M}) | \forall K \subset \mathscr{M} \textit{ compact}, J^{-/+}(K,g) \cap \operatorname{supp} v \textit{ is compact}\} . \end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

(b) *Propagation of supports:*

$$\operatorname{supp}(\Delta_P^{\text{ret/adv}} v) \subset J^{+/-}(\operatorname{supp} v, \hat{g}) \subset J^{+/-}(\operatorname{supp} v, g) \tag{47}$$

for all $v \in \mathscr{D}'_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g)$.

(c) *Propagation of singularities: Given any* $v \in \mathscr{D}'_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g)$*, we have that* $(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{WF}(\Delta_P^{\text{ret/adv}} v)$ *if and only if either* $(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{WF}(v)$ *or there is* $\Lambda > 0$ *and a null geodesic segment* $\gamma : [0,\Lambda] \to \mathscr{M}$ *with respect to* $\hat{g}$ *such that* $\mathrm{WF}(v) \cap E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma \neq \varnothing$, $(x,\xi) \in E^{\hat{g}}_\gamma$.

We have that for all $v \in \mathscr{D}'_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g)$, $u = \Delta_P^{\text{ret/adv}} v$ *is the unique solution of* $Pu = v$ *on* $\mathscr{M}$ *belonging to* $\mathscr{D}'_{+/-}(\mathscr{M},g)$. ☐

Corollary 3.2.5 implies that the causal propagator Δ_P propagates singularities in the following fashion: since $\mathrm{WF}(u) \subset \mathrm{WF}(Pu) \cup \{(x,\xi) \in T^*\mathscr{M} \smallsetminus 0 | g^{-1}(x)(\xi,\xi) = 0\}$ for all $u \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})$ (see for instance Proposition 5.1.1, page 113 of [26]), we conclude that, for all $v \in$, $(x,\xi) \in \mathrm{WF}(\Delta_P v)$ if and only if

3.2.6. Remark. It is easy to see that $\mathscr{D}'_\pm(\mathscr{M},g)$ is the topological dual of the space

$$\mathscr{D}_\mp(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) = \{\omega \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) | \exists K \subset \mathscr{M} \text{ compact: } \operatorname{supp}\omega \subset J^\mp(K,g)\} . \tag{48}$$

The causal propagator Δ_P allows a covariant description of the space of solutions of $Pu = 0$, which is a strengthening of Lemma A.3, page 227 of [25]. We state and prove the result only for scalar fields, but it actually holds for arbitrary vector bundles [3]:

3.2.7. Lemma. *Let* $u \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})$*. Then* $Pu = 0$ *if and only if* $u = \Delta_P v$ *for some* $v \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})$ *such that* $\operatorname{supp} v$ *is both past and future compact. If* $\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma$ *is compact for some (hence, any) Cauchy hypersurface, we can choose* v *such that* $\operatorname{supp} v$ *is compact. In both cases, we can choose* v *such that* $\operatorname{supp} v$ *is contained in a neighborhood of any prescribed Cauchy hypersurface* Σ *for* $(\mathscr{M},g)$*. Moreover,* $\Delta_P v = 0$ *if and only if* $v = Pw$ *for some* $w \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})$ *such that* $\operatorname{supp} w$ *is both past and future compact; if* $\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma$ *is compact for some (hence, any) Cauchy hypersurface, then* $\operatorname{supp} w$ *is compact.*

Proof. Let Σ be any Cauchy hypersurface for $(\mathscr{M}, g)$. By the results in [7], there is a Cauchy time function τ in $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ such that $\Sigma = \tau^{-1}(t_0)$ for some $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. We consider the following separate cases:

(a) $\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma$ non-compact: $U_1, U_2 \subset \mathscr{M}$ open such that $U_1 = \tau^{-1}((-\infty, t_0 + \epsilon))$ and $U_2 = \tau^{-1}((t_0 - \epsilon, +\infty))$ for some $\epsilon > 0$. Let $\{\chi_1, \chi_2\}$ be a partition of unity subordinated to $\{U_1, U_2\}$. We have that $u = \chi_1 u + \chi_2 u$, and hence $P(\chi_1 u) = -P(\chi_2 u) = v$ is supported inside $\tau^{-1}((t_0 - \epsilon, t_0 + \epsilon))$, whose closure is past and future compact. Since $\chi_1 u$ has past compact support and $\chi_2 u$ has future compact support, we have that $\chi_1 u = \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P(P(\chi_1 u)$ and $\chi_2 u = \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P(P(\chi_2 u)) = -\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P(P(\chi_1 u))$, whence it follows that $u = \Delta_P(P(\chi_1 u)) = -\Delta_P(P(\chi_2 u)) = \Delta_P v$.

(b) $\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma$ compact: $V_1, V_2, V_3 \subset \mathscr{M}$ open such that $U_1 = I^-(K \cap \Sigma, g)$, $U_2 = I^+(K \cap \Sigma, g)$ and $V_3 = \mathscr{M} \smallsetminus (J^+(\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma, g) \cup J^-(\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma, g))$, where $K \subset \Sigma$ is a compact subset whose interior in Σ contains $\operatorname{supp} u \cap \Sigma$, so that $\overline{U_1 \cap U_2}$ is compact. Let $\{\chi'_1, \chi'_2, \chi'_3\}$ be a partition of unity subordinated to $\{V_1, V_2, V_3\}$. We have by Theorem 3.2.4 that $u = \chi'_1 u + \chi'_2 u$ and hence $P(\chi'_1 u) = -P(\chi'_2 u) = v$ is supported in the compact subset $J^-(K, g) \cap J^+(K, g)$. Since $\chi'_1 u$ has past compact support and $\chi_2 u$ has future compact support, we have that $\chi'_1 u = \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P(P(\chi'_1 u)$ and $\chi'_2 u = \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P(P(\chi'_2 u)) = -\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P(P(\chi'_1 u))$, whence it follows that $u = \Delta_P(P(\chi'_1 u)) = -\Delta_P(P(\chi'_2 u)) = \Delta_P v$.

Finally, if v has past and future compact support, and $\Delta_P v = 0$, we clearly have that $\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P v = \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P v = w$ has past and future compact support as well, whence $v = Pw$ by Corollary 3.2.5. If in addition $\operatorname{supp} v$ is compact, then w has compact support as well. ☐

We conclude with the following result:

3.2.8. Proposition. *Let $\lambda \mapsto P_\lambda$, $\lambda \in (a, b)$, $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ be a smooth curve of normally hyperbolic linear partial differential operators on $\Gamma^\infty(\pi)$ satisfying (NH_g), in the sense that P_λ is such an operator for every $\lambda \in (a, b)$ and $\lambda \mapsto (P_\lambda u)(f)$ is smooth for all $u \in \mathscr{D}'(\pi)$, $f \in \Gamma^\infty_c(\mathscr{E}' \otimes \wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$. Then $\lambda \mapsto K^{\Sigma,j}_{P_\lambda}$ $(j = 0, 1)$, $\lambda \mapsto \Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda}$, $\lambda \mapsto \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{P_\lambda}$ and $\lambda \mapsto \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{P_\lambda}$ are smooth in the sense that $\lambda \mapsto (K^{\Sigma,j}_{P_\lambda} u_j)(f)$, $\lambda \mapsto (\Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda} v)(f)$, $\lambda \mapsto (\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{P_\lambda} v)(f)$ and $\lambda \mapsto (\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{P_\lambda} v^-)(f)$ are smooth for all $u_j \in \mathscr{D}'(\Sigma)$, $j = 0, 1$, $v \in \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})$, $v^\pm \in \mathscr{D}'_\pm(\mathscr{M}, g)$. Moreover, one has the following "resolvent-type" formulae:*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda} K^{\Sigma,j}_{P_\lambda} = -\Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda} \dot{P}_\lambda K^{\Sigma,j}_{P_\lambda} \ , \tag{49}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda} \Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda} = -\Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda} \dot{P}_\lambda \Delta^\Sigma_{P_\lambda} \ , \tag{50}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda} \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{P_\lambda} = -\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{P_\lambda} \dot{P}_\lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{P_\lambda} \ , \tag{51}$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda} \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{P_\lambda} = -\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{P_\lambda} \dot{P}_\lambda \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{P_\lambda} \ , \tag{52}$$

where $\dot{P}_\lambda u = \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}(P_\lambda u)$ for all $u \in \mathscr{D}'(\mathscr{M})$.

Proof. The proof of the restrictions of (49)–(52) to smooth arguments will be performed in the second paper of this series. The general case then follows from Theorem 3.2.4 and Corollary 3.2.5. □

Let g' be a Lorentzian metric on $\mathscr{M}$, a priori unrelated to either the space-time metric g or the metric $\hat{g}$ associated to the principal symbol of a normally hyperbolic linear partial differential operator P. Given $\omega \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$, we define $*_{g'}\omega \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ as the unique smooth function on $\mathscr{M}$ such that

$$\omega = (*_{g'}\omega)\mathrm{d}\mu_{g'} \ . \tag{53}$$

Conversely, if $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, we have that

$$\vec{\varphi} = *_{g'}(\vec{\varphi}\mathrm{d}\mu_{g'}) \ . \tag{54}$$

The following result follows immediately from Theorem 3.2.4.

3.2.9. LEMMA. *Let g' be a Lorentzian metric on $\mathscr{M}$ and $P : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be a linear partial differential operator. Then P is formally self-adjoint with respect to the L^2 scalar product associated to $\mathrm{d}\mu_{g'}$ if and only if the map $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \ni \vec{\varphi} \mapsto (P\vec{\varphi})\mathrm{d}\mu_{g'} \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$ has a symmetric distribution kernel. In either fact holds (hence both), the distribution kernel of $\Delta_P^{\mathrm{adv}} \circ *_{g'}$ is the adjoint of the distribution kernel of $\Delta_P^{\mathrm{ret}} \circ *_{g'}$.* □

The situation we have in mind is, of course, when $P\vec{\varphi} = *_{g'}E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0]\vec{\varphi}$, where $\mathscr{L}$ is a *real-valued*, microlocal generalized Lagrangian of first order on $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ open in the compact-open topology. Generally, given a microlocal generalized Lagrangian $\mathscr{L}$ of order r on $\mathscr{U}$, $E(\mathscr{L})$ is a *quasi-linear* partial differential operator, that is, $E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi]$ is linear in the highest order derivatives of φ. Therefore, we say that the partial differential operator of second order $E(\mathscr{L})$ is *normally hyperbolic* on $\mathscr{U}$ if, for all $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$, $P = *_{g'}E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0]$ is normally hyperbolic for some (hence any) Lorentzian metric g' on $\mathscr{M}$. In this case, we denote the metric associated to the principal symbol of P defined as above by $\hat{g}_\mathscr{L} = \hat{g}_\mathscr{L}[\varphi_0]$, and write

$$K^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \doteq K^{\Sigma,j}_P \quad (j = 0, 1) \ , \tag{55}$$

$$\Delta^{\Sigma}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \doteq \Delta^{\Sigma}_P \circ *_{g'} \ , \tag{56}$$

$$\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \doteq \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_P \circ *_{g'} \ , \tag{57}$$

$$\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \doteq \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_P \circ *_{g'} \ . \tag{58}$$

We remark that different choices of g' affect $\hat{g}_\mathscr{L}$ only by a φ_0-independent conformal factor – in particular, the causal structure of $\hat{g}_\mathscr{L}$ is independent of g'.

3.2.10. REMARK. Let us display a sufficiently nontrivial example of a microlocal generalized Lagrangian with normally hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange operator. For instance,

$$\mathscr{L}(f)(\varphi) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathscr{M}} f\left[g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi, \mathrm{d}\varphi) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}(1 + \varphi^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi, \mathrm{d}\varphi)^2\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_g \ , \quad \epsilon \geq 0 \ . \tag{59}$$

The Euler-Lagrange operator of $\mathscr{L}$ is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] &= \left[(1+\epsilon(1+\varphi^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi,\mathrm{d}\varphi))\Box_g\varphi + \epsilon(2\nabla^2\varphi(g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\varphi),g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\varphi)) - \frac{1}{2}g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi,\mathrm{d}\varphi)\varphi)\right]\mathrm{d}\mu_g\ ,\\
\Box_g\varphi &= g^{-1}(\nabla^2\varphi)\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{60}
$$

whose linearization around φ_0 is given by

$$
\begin{aligned}
E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0]\vec{\varphi} = {} & \bigl[(1+\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))\Box_g\vec{\varphi} + 2\epsilon\nabla^2\vec{\varphi}(g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0),g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))\\
& + 2\epsilon\Biggl[\left((1+\varphi_0^2)\Box_g\varphi_0 - \frac{1}{2}\varphi_0\right)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\vec{\varphi}) + 2\nabla^2\varphi_0(g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0),g^\sharp(\mathrm{d}\vec{\varphi}))\\
& + \epsilon g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0)\left(2\Box_g\varphi_0 - \frac{1}{2}\right)\vec{\varphi}\Biggr]\mathrm{d}\mu_g\\
= {} & \bigl[\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\nabla^2\vec{\varphi}) + \nabla_A\vec{\varphi} + B\vec{\varphi}\bigr]\mathrm{d}\mu_g\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{61}
$$

where $A(p) = A(g(p),\varphi_0(p),\nabla\varphi_0(p),\nabla^2\varphi_0(p))$ and $B = B(g(p),\varphi_0(p),\nabla\varphi_0(p),\nabla^2\varphi_0(p))$ for all $p\in\mathscr{M}$. The principal symbol of $P = *_g E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0]$ reads

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X_1),g^\flat(X_2)) = {} & (1+\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))g(X_1,X_2)\\
& + 2\epsilon(\nabla_{X_1}\varphi_0)(\nabla_{X_2}\varphi_0)\ ,
\end{aligned}
\tag{62}
$$

whence we conclude that

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) > 0 &\Leftrightarrow (1+\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))g(X,X) > -2\epsilon(\nabla_X\varphi_0)^2\ ,\\
\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) = 0 &\Leftrightarrow (1+\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))g(X,X) = -2\epsilon(\nabla_X\varphi_0)^2\ ,\\
\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) < 0 &\Leftrightarrow (1+\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0))g(X,X) < -2\epsilon(\nabla_X\varphi_0)^2\ .
\end{aligned}
\tag{63}
$$

We consider the following three possibilities:

$$
g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0) > -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)}\ ,
\tag{64}
$$

$$
g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)}\ ,
\tag{65}
$$

$$
g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0,\mathrm{d}\varphi_0) < -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)}\ .
\tag{66}
$$

Inequalities (64) and (66) define open subsets of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ in the Whitney topology. In case (64) holds, we have that $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) < 0$ implies $g(X,X) < 0$ and $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) = 0$ implies $g(X,X)\leq 0$, whereas $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) > 0$ does not constrain the causal character of X with respect to g. In case (65) holds, we have that $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(Y)) = 0$ for all tangent vectors Y if X satisfies $\nabla_X\varphi_0 = 0$ (hence $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]$ becomes degenerate); moreover, $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]$ cannot have any timelike covectors. In case (66) holds, we have that $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) < 0$ implies $g(X,X) > 0$ and $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) = 0$ implies $g(X,X)\geq 0$, whereas $\hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](g^\flat(X),g^\flat(X)) >$

0 does not constrain the causal character of X with respect to g. To summarize,

$$g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0, \mathrm{d}\varphi_0) > -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)} \Rightarrow \hat{g}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \lesssim g \ , \tag{67}$$

$$g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0, \mathrm{d}\varphi_0) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)} \Rightarrow \hat{g}^{-1}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \text{ degenerate} \ , \tag{68}$$

$$g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0, \mathrm{d}\varphi_0) < -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)} \Rightarrow -\hat{g}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0] \lesssim g \ . \tag{69}$$

In other words, crossing the boundary $g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0, \mathrm{d}\varphi_0) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)}$ causes $\hat{g}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]$'s signature to change sign, partitioning $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ into two Whitney-open, disjoint "domains of hyperbolicity" separated by the boundary $g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi_0, \mathrm{d}\varphi_0) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi_0^2)}$. The presence of this boundary is linked to the lifespan of solutions of $E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] = 0$; indeed, the "sharp continuation principle" of Majda (Theorem 2.2, pp. 31–32 in [55]) implies that, at least when $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ is the Minkowski space-time, if a solution φ to $E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] = 0$ with given Cauchy data at $\Sigma = \tau^{-1}(0)$ blows up in $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ as $\tau(p) \to t^* > 0$ but the second-order jet prolongation of φ is bounded in $K \cap \tau^{-1}([0, t^*))$ for any compact subset $K \subset \mathscr{M}$, then we must have that $g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\varphi(p), \mathrm{d}\varphi(p)) + \frac{1}{2\epsilon(1+\varphi^2(p))} \xrightarrow{\tau(p)\to t^*} 0$, where τ is a Cauchy time function on $(\mathscr{M}, g)$. We stress that it is not hard to provide examples of φ_0 which fall into either (67) or (69) – for (67) to hold, it suffices to choose φ_0 with everywhere spacelike gradient; as for (69), any Cauchy time function $\varphi_0 = \tau$ on $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ satisfying $g^{-1}(\mathrm{d}\tau, \mathrm{d}\tau) < -(2\epsilon)^{-1}$ does the trick, and any globally hyperbolic space-time admit such Cauchy time functions [61]. On the other hand, this is a typical "large data" phenomenon, specially if ϵ is small. Since the nonlinear terms of $E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi]$ vanish to third order at $\varphi = 0$, one can show, at least when $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ is the Minkowski space-time, that $E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi] = 0$ has unique, global smooth solutions for sufficiently small Cauchy data [41, 70].

Motivated by formula (17) in Remark 2.3.9, we write for each $\vec{\psi}_j \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\Sigma)$, $j = 0, 1$, $\omega \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$, $\omega^\pm \in \Gamma^\infty_\pm(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}, g)$

$$D^k K^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k)\vec{\psi}_j \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} K^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}}\left[\varphi_0 + \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \vec{\varphi}_l\right] \vec{\psi}_j \ , \tag{70}$$

$$D^k \Delta^{\Sigma}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k)\omega \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} \Delta^{\Sigma}_{\mathscr{L}}\left[\varphi_0 + \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \vec{\varphi}_l\right] \omega \ , \tag{71}$$

$$D^k \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k)\omega^+ \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}\left[\varphi_0 + \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \vec{\varphi}_l\right] \omega^+ \ , \tag{72}$$

$$D^k \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k)\omega^- \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}\left[\varphi_0 + \sum_{l=1}^k \lambda_l \vec{\varphi}_l\right] \omega^- \ . \tag{73}$$

Combining Proposition 3.2.3 with the chain rule (100) yields for each $\vec{\psi}_j \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\Sigma)$, $j = 0, 1$, $\omega \in \Gamma^\infty(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M})$, $\omega^\pm \in \Gamma^\infty_\pm(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}, g)$ that

$$DK^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi})\vec{\psi}_j = -\Delta^\Sigma_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]D^2E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0](K^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}}\vec{\psi}_j, \vec{\varphi}) \ , \tag{74}$$

$$D\Delta^\Sigma_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi})\omega = -\Delta^\Sigma_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]D^2E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0](\Delta^\Sigma_{\mathscr{L}}\omega, \vec{\varphi}) \ , \tag{75}$$

$$D\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi})\omega^+ = -\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]D^2E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0](\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}\omega^+, \vec{\varphi}) \ , \tag{76}$$

$$D\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi})\omega^- = -\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi_0]D^2E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi_0](\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}\omega^-, \vec{\varphi}) \ , \tag{77}$$

whence it follows together with Faà di Bruno's formula (104), Theorem 3.2.4 and Proposition 3.2.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
D^k K^{\Sigma,j}_{\mathscr{L}} &: \mathscr{U} \times (\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))^k \times \mathscr{D}(\Sigma) \to \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})(j = 0, 1) \ , \\
D^k \Delta^\Sigma_{\mathscr{L}} &: \mathscr{U} \times (\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))^k \times \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M}) \ , \\
D^k \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}} &: \mathscr{U} \times (\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))^k \times \mathscr{D}'_+(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}, g) \to \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M}) \text{ and} \\
D^k \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}} &: \mathscr{U} \times (\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))^k \times \mathscr{D}'_-(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}, g) \to \mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\mathscr{M})
\end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

exist and are jointly continuous for all $k \geq 1$, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathscr{D}'_\Sigma(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) &\doteq \{u \in \mathscr{D}'(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) | \mathrm{WF}(u) \cap N^*\Sigma = \varnothing\} \ , \\
\mathscr{D}'_\pm(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}, g) &\doteq \{u \in \mathscr{D}'(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M} \to \mathscr{M}) | \exists K \subset \mathscr{M} \text{ compact:} \\
&\qquad J^\mp(K) \cap \operatorname{supp} u \text{ compact}\} \ .
\end{aligned}$$

3.2.11. Definition. Let $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology, $F, G \in \mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$. The *retarded* and *advanced products* $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$ with respect to $\mathscr{L}$ are functionals respectively given by

$$\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)(\varphi) \doteq \left\langle F^{(1)}[\varphi], \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]G^{(1)}[\varphi]\right\rangle \tag{79}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)(\varphi) &\doteq \left\langle F^{(1)}[\varphi], \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]G^{(1)}[\varphi]\right\rangle \\
&= \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(G, F)(\varphi) \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{80}$$

Their difference

$$\{F, G\}_{\mathscr{L}} \doteq \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G) - \mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G) = \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G) - \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(G, F) \tag{81}$$

is called the *Peierls bracket* of F with G with respect to $\mathscr{L}$.

By Lemma 3.2.9, the Peierls bracket is antisymmetric in its entries, becoming an obvious candidate for a Poisson bracket. Let us prove some basic properties of $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$.

3.2.12. PROPOSITION. *Let $\mathscr{U}, F, G$ as in Definition 3.2.11. Then $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$ and $\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ are smooth and satisfy the support properties*

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)\subset J^+(\operatorname{supp}F,g)\cap J^-(\operatorname{supp}G,g)\ , \tag{82}$$

$$\operatorname{supp}\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)\subset J^+(\operatorname{supp}G,g)\cap J^-(\operatorname{supp}F,g)\ , \tag{83}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{supp}\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}\subset{}&(J^+(\operatorname{supp}F,g)\cup J^-(\operatorname{supp}F,g))\\&\cap(J^+(\operatorname{supp}G,g)\cup J^-(\operatorname{supp}G,g))\ .\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Proof. Notice that $\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ and $\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ depend on the background field configuration φ only so far as the coefficients of $E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi]$ depend on φ. Therefore, by part (b) of Theorem 3.2.4, for all $\omega\in\Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M})$ any modification of φ outside $J^+(\operatorname{supp}f,g)$ (resp. $J^-(\operatorname{supp}f,g)$) leaves $\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]f$ (resp. $\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]f$) unaltered. Since $\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ is the formal adjoint of $\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$, the above reasoning together with part (b) of Theorem 3.2.4 imply that $\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ and $\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ have the desired support properties. Now we are only left with proving that $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$ is a smooth functional, since the proof of the corresponding statement for $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$ will be analogous and both together imply the corresponding result for $\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$. This, however, follows from formulae (51) and (52) in Proposition 3.2.8 together with Leibniz's rule (101) and Faà di Bruno's formula (104), which give us that

$$\begin{aligned}D^k\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\dots,\vec{\varphi}_k)={}&\sum_{\{J_1,J_2,J_3\}\subset P_k}F^{(|J_1|+1)}[\varphi]((\otimes_{j_1\in J_1}\vec{\varphi}_{j_1})\\&\otimes D^{|J_2|}\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]((\otimes_{j_2\in J_2}\vec{\varphi}_{j_2})\otimes G^{(|J_3|+1)}[\varphi](\otimes_{j_3\in J_3}\vec{\varphi}_{j_3})))\ ,\\D^k\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\dots,\vec{\varphi}_k)={}&\sum_{\{J_1,J_2,J_3\}\subset P_k}F^{(|J_1|+1)}[\varphi]((\otimes_{j_1\in J_1}\vec{\varphi}_{j_1})\\&\otimes D^{|J_2|}\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]((\otimes_{j_2\in J_2}\vec{\varphi}_{j_2})\otimes G^{(|J_3|+1)}[\varphi](\otimes_{j_3\in J_3}\vec{\varphi}_{j_3})))\ .\end{aligned} \tag{85}$$

where P_k is set of all partitions of the set $\{1,\dots,k\}$. The proof is complete. □

By part (c) of Theorem 3.2.4, $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$ and $\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ are actually defined for any pair of smooth functionals F,G with compact space-time support such that $\mathrm{WF}(F^{(1)}[\varphi])$ and $\mathrm{WF}(G^{(1)}[\varphi])$ do not contain any causal covectors with respect to g for all $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$, provided that $\hat{g}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]\lesssim g$ for all such φ. This motivates the following

3.2.13. DEFINITION. Let $(\mathscr{M},g)$ be a globally hyperbolic space-time. Define for all $k\geq 1$ the open subsets $\Upsilon_{k,g}\subset T^*\mathscr{M}^k\smallsetminus 0$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Upsilon_{k,g}&=\{((x_1,\dots,x_k),(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k))\in T^*\mathscr{M}^k\smallsetminus 0|\\&\qquad(\xi_1,\dots,\xi_k)\notin\overline{V}^k_{+,g}(x_1,\dots,x_k)\cup\overline{V}^k_{-,g}(x_1,\dots,x_k)\}\ ,\\\overline{V}^k_{\pm,g}(x_1,\dots,x_k)&=\prod_{j=1}^k\overline{V}_{\pm,g}(x_j)\ ,\\V_{\pm,g}(x)&=I^{\pm}(0,g^{-1}(x))\subset T^*_x\mathscr{M}\ ,\ x\in\mathscr{M}\ .\end{aligned} \tag{86}$$

Let now $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology. We say that a smooth functional F with compact space-time support is *microcausal* with respect to g if $\mathrm{WF}(F^{(k)}[\varphi])\subset\Upsilon_{k,g}$ for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$, $k \geq 1$. The space of all microcausal functionals in $\mathscr{U}$ with respect to g is denoted by $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$.

We obviously have that $\mathscr{F}_0(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) \subset \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$. A much more interesting inclusion is given by the following

3.2.14. PROPOSITION. *Let* $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *be open in the compact-open topology,* $F \in \mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$. *Then* $\mathrm{WF}(F^{(k)}[\varphi]) \perp T\Delta_k(\mathscr{M})$ *for all* $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$, $k \geq 2$. *In particular,* $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U}) \subset \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$.

Proof. Let $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$. For all $k \geq 2$, $F^{(k)}[\varphi]$ is the kernel of a $(k-1)$-linear, $(k-1)$-differential operator taking values in the vector bundle of $\mathbb{C}$-valued d-forms, as shown by Propositions 2.3.11 and 2.3.12. That is, if $\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k-2} \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, then $F^{(k)}[\varphi](\cdot, \vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_{k-1})$ can be thought of locally in $\mathscr{M}$ as a sum of products of d-form-valued linear partial differential operators acting on $\vec{\varphi}_{k-1}$ multiplied by a product of derivatives of $\vec{\varphi}_j$ for all $1 \leq j \leq k-2$. This means that $F^{(k)}[\varphi]$ can be written locally as a finite sum of derivatives of the Dirac kernel δ_k in $\mathscr{M}^k$, defined by

$$\delta^\omega_k(\vec{\varphi}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \vec{\varphi}_k) \doteq \int_{\mathscr{M}} \prod_{j=1}^k \vec{\varphi}_j \omega \ ,$$

multiplied by smooth d-forms on $\mathscr{M}$. Since δ^ω_k is simply the pullback by the inclusion $\Delta_k(\mathscr{M}) \hookrightarrow \mathscr{M}^k$, the assertion follows from Theorem 8.2.4, pp. 263–265 of [39]. □

Proposition 3.2.14 justifies the term "microlocal" for designating the elements of $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M}, \mathscr{U})$, establishing the link with the notion of local functional employed in [12]. Moreover, we have the following strengthening of Proposition 3.2.12, which is crucial to this whole Subsection and justifies the christening "microcausal" given to the elements of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$.

3.2.15. PROPOSITION. *Let* $\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{L}$ *be as in Proposition 3.2.12,* $F, G \in \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$. *Then* $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$ *and* $\{F, G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ *also belong to* $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$, *and possess respectively the support properties* (82), (83) *and* (84).

Proof. The proof of (82), (83) and (84) carries through *ipsis literis* as in the case that F and G are microlocal. Moreover, Faà di Bruno's formula (104) together with formulae (51)–(52) of Proposition 3.2.8, $D^k\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$, $D^k\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)$ and $D^k\{F, G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ remain well defined for F, G microcausal and all $k \geq 1$. All that remains is to check that $\mathrm{WF}(D^k\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)[\varphi]), \mathrm{WF}(D^k\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(F, G)[\varphi]) \subset \Upsilon_{k,g}$ for all $k \geq 1$. This, however, follows from successive applications of Theorem 8.2.13, pp. 268–269 of [39]. The proof is complete. □

There is a pair of very important relations among $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\{\cdot, \cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$, from which a number of key properties of the Peierls bracket follow.

3.2.16. LEMMA. *For any microcausal functionals* F, G, H *it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, F), G\}_{\mathscr{L}} + \{F, \mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, G)\}_{\mathscr{L}} - \mathsf{A}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, \{F, G\}_{\mathscr{L}}) \\
&= \{\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, F), G\}_{\mathscr{L}} + \{F, \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, G)\}_{\mathscr{L}} - \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H, \{F, G\}_{\mathscr{L}}) \qquad (87) \\
&= H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}} F^{(1)}, \Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}} G^{(1)}) - H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}} F^{(1)}, \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}} G^{(1)}) \ .
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. We will prove only the second identity, the first follows from an analogous calculation. First we need a couple of auxiliary formulae for the functional derivatives of $\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G)$ and $\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ along $\vec{\varphi}\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, F,G fixed microcausal functionals. From the chain rule (100) together with formulae (51)–(52) of Proposition 3.2.8, we obtain

$$\langle D\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G),\vec{\varphi}\rangle = F^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\vec{\varphi}) + G^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\vec{\varphi}) - \left\langle F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\vec{\varphi})\right\rangle$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle \{F,G\}^{(1)}_{\mathscr{L}},\vec{\varphi}\right\rangle &= \langle D\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(F,G) - D\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(G,F),\vec{\varphi}\rangle\\ &= F^{(2)}(\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\vec{\varphi}) - G^{(2)}(\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\vec{\varphi}) - \left\langle F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\vec{\varphi})\right\rangle\\ &+ \left\langle G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\vec{\varphi})\right\rangle\ .\end{aligned}$$

With these formulae at hand, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,F),G\}_{\mathscr{L}} &= \left\langle \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,F)^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)}\right\rangle = H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)})\\ &+ F^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)}) - \left\langle H^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)})\right\rangle,\\ \{F,\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,G)\}_{\mathscr{L}} &= -\{\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,G),F\}_{\mathscr{L}} = -H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)})\\ &- G^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)}) + \left\langle H^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)})\right\rangle\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}) &= \left\langle \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)},\{F,G\}^{(1)}_{\mathscr{L}}\right\rangle = F^{(2)}(\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)})\\ &- G^{(2)}(\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)}) - \left\langle F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)})\right\rangle\\ &+ \left\langle G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}\circ D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)})\right\rangle\ .\end{aligned}$$

Summing the first two formulae and subtracting the third, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\{\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,F),G\}_{\mathscr{L}} &+ \{F,\mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,G)\}_{\mathscr{L}} - \mathsf{R}_{\mathscr{L}}(H,\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}})\\ &= H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)}) - H^{(2)}(\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)})\\ &+ \left\langle \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)},D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)})\right\rangle\\ &- \left\langle \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)},D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)})\right\rangle\\ &+ \left\langle \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)})\right\rangle\\ &- \left\langle \Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}G^{(1)},D^2E(\mathscr{L})(\Delta^{\mathrm{ret}}_{\mathscr{L}}F^{(1)},\Delta^{\mathrm{adv}}_{\mathscr{L}}H^{(1)})\right\rangle\ .\end{aligned}$$

The conclusion follows from the fact that $\langle\vec{\varphi}_1,D^2E(\mathscr{L})[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_2,\vec{\varphi}_3)\rangle = D^3\mathscr{L}(1)[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\vec{\varphi}_2,\vec{\varphi}_3)$ is completely symmetric with respect to its linear arguments and hence the last four terms in the right hand side of the last formula cancel among each other. □

We remark that the key fact leading to (87) is that $D^3\mathscr{L}(1)$ is totally symmetric in its linear arguments. This, on its turn, is of course linked to the flatness of the ultralocal connection D defines in Subsection 2.2, which guarantees that the causal propagator for $E'(\mathscr{L})[\varphi]$ at each

φ defines a tensor, and (87) has a coordinate independent meaning at the functional level. We remark, however, that $\Delta_{\mathscr{L}}$ is not defined on the whole of $\wedge^2 T^*\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, but only in the subbundle $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})\times\wedge^2(\mathscr{D}'_{+,g}(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M})\cap\mathscr{D}'_{-,g}(\wedge^d T^*\mathscr{M}\to\mathscr{M}))$.

An immediate consequence of the first identity in (87) is:

3.2.17. Corollary. *The Peierls bracket $F,G\mapsto\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ defines a Lie bracket on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ for any globally hyperbolic metric g on $\mathscr{M}$ such that $g\gtrsim\hat{g}_{\mathscr{L}}[\varphi]$ for all $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$.*

Proof. $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ is clearly bilinear. Antisymmetry of $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ follows from the argument right after Definition 3.2.11. All that is left to us is to prove that the Jacobi identity holds, that is,

$$\{F,\{G,H\}_{\mathscr{L}}\}_{\mathscr{L}}+\{G,\{H,F\}_{\mathscr{L}}\}_{\mathscr{L}}+\{H,\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}\}_{\mathscr{L}}=0\ . \tag{88}$$

This follows from the first identity in (87). □

We shall prove in Section 4 that $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ is closed under products and that the Peierls bracket satisfies Leibniz's rule (Theorem 4.0.21). In other words, $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ becomes a Poisson algebra when endowed with the Peierls bracket associated to $\mathscr{L}$.

4. First structural results

With the body of results of Sections 2 and 3 at hand, we can start a detailed and motivated discussion of the mathematical structures underlying our approach.

We can endow $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ with a topology which, despite being quite weak, accommodates rather well our algebraic operations. The weakest possible choice is the topology of pointwise convergence of functionals and their derivatives of all orders, which is the locally convex topology on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ induced by the separating system of seminorms

$$F\mapsto|F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_k)|\ ,\quad\varphi\in\mathscr{U},\ \vec{\varphi}_1,\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_k\in\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}),\ k\in\mathbb{N}\ .$$

Equivalently, this topology is the initial locally convex topology on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ induced by the linear maps

$$F\mapsto\begin{cases}F(\varphi)\in\mathbb{C} & (k=0)\\ F^{(k)}[\varphi]\in\mathscr{E}'(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}) & (k\geq1)\end{cases}\ ,\quad\varphi\in\mathscr{U}\ , \tag{89}$$

where the space $\mathscr{E}'(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M})$ of d-form-valued distributions of compact support on $\mathscr{M}^k$ is the topological dual of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}^k)$. This choice, however, ignores the extra information on the wave front sets of $F^{(k)}[\varphi]$ which enters Definition 3.2.13 for microcausal functionals. A more natural choice is to replace the spaces of general, compactly supported distribution densities in (89) for each $k\geq1$ by the following subspaces:

$$\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)=\{u\in\mathscr{E}'(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)|\mathrm{WF}(u)\subset\Upsilon_{k,g}\}\ . \tag{90}$$

These, however, are not standard spaces of compactly supported distributions with wave front sets within a prescribed (closed) cone, for $\Upsilon_{k,g}$ as defined in (86) is an *open* conic subset of $T^*\mathscr{M}^k\smallsetminus0$. Therefore, one cannot immediately endow $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ with the Hörmander topology (see, for instance, Section 8.2 of [39]). It is possible, on the other hand, to define

$\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$ as an inductive limit of an increasing sequence of spaces of compactly supported distributions with wave front sets contained in an increasing sequence of *closed* conic subsets of $T^*\mathscr{M}^k \smallsetminus 0$, each of these spaces being endowed with the Hörmander topology. The key result which allows us to do this is the following

4.0.18. LEMMA. *For each* $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ *there is a countable family* $\{\Gamma_{k,m}\}_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ *of closed conic subsets of* $T^*\mathscr{M}^k$ *such that* $\Gamma_{k,m} \subset \mathring{\Gamma}_{k,m+1}$ *and* $\cup_{m=0}^{\infty}\Gamma_{k,m} = \Upsilon_{k,g}$ *is given by* (86).

Proof. Let ω be a future directed timelike covector field in $(\mathscr{M}, g)$ and $\epsilon > 0$ such that $g_\epsilon \doteq g - \epsilon u \otimes u$ is a Lorentzian metric. We have that $g < g_{\epsilon'} < g_\epsilon$ and hence $V_{\pm,g_\epsilon}(x) \supset \overline{V}_{\pm,g_{\epsilon'}}(x)$ for all $0 < \epsilon' < \epsilon$, $x \in M$. Let now $(\epsilon_m)_{m\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence of positive real numbers such that $\epsilon_0 = \epsilon$, $\epsilon_{m+1} < \epsilon_m$ and $\epsilon_m \overset{m\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$. We conclude that, for all $x \in \mathscr{M}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\complement(\overline{V}_{+,g}(x) \cup \overline{V}_{-,g}(x)) &= \left(\bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \complement(V_{+,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x) \cup V_{-,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x))\right) \smallsetminus \{0\} \\ &= \left(\bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \complement(V_{+,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x) \cup V_{-,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x)) \smallsetminus \{0\}\right) .\end{aligned}$$

The above argument settles the case $k = 1$. For $k > 1$, we can write $\complement(\overline{V}^k_{+,g}(x_1, \ldots, x_k) \cup \overline{V}^k_{-,g}(x_1, \ldots, x_k))$ as a union of subsets of the form $\Omega = \prod_{j=1}^k W_j$, such that the possibilities for Ω fall in exactly one of the following three categories:

(a) $W_j = \complement(\overline{V}_{+,g}(x_j) \cup \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_j))$ for at least one j, and all $W_{j'}$'s which are not of this form are of the form $W_{j'} = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_{j'}) \cup \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_{j'})$. There are $\sum_{k'=1}^k \binom{k}{k'} = 2^k - 1$ such Ω's.

(b) For all $j = 1, \ldots, k$, we have either $W_j = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_j) \smallsetminus \{0\}$ or $W_j = \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_j) \smallsetminus \{0\}$, and there is at least one pair $j, j' \subset \{1, \ldots, k\}$, such that $W_j = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_j) \smallsetminus \{0\}$ and $W_{j'} = \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_{j'}) \smallsetminus \{0\}$. There are $\sum_{k'=1}^{k-1} \binom{k}{k'} = 2^k - 2$ such Ω's (we remark that this number is zero for $k = 1$).

(c) $W_j = \{0\}$ for at least one j, all $W_{j'}$'s which are not of this form are either of the form $W_{j'} = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_{j'}) \smallsetminus \{0\}$ or $W_{j'} = \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_{j'}) \smallsetminus \{0\}$, and there is at least one pair $j', j'' \subset \{j = 1, \ldots, k | W_j \neq \{0\}\}$ such that $W_{j'} = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_{j'}) \smallsetminus \{0\}$ and $W_{j''} = \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_{j''}) \smallsetminus \{0\}$. There are

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{k'=1}^{k-2} (2^{k-k'} - 2)\binom{k}{k'} &= 2^k \left(\frac{3^k}{2^k} - 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} - \frac{2k}{2^k}\right) - 2(2^k - 2 - k) \\ &= 3^k - 3 \cdot 2^k + 3\end{aligned}$$

such Ω's (we remark that this number is zero for $k = 1, 2$).

Let us enumerate the $3^k - 2^k$ subsets Ω listed above, so that the first $2^k - 1$ ones are of type (a), and the remaining ones are of types (b) and (c):

$$\begin{aligned}\complement(\overline{V}^k_{+,g}(x_1,\ldots,x_k) \cup \overline{V}^k_{-,g}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)) &= \bigcup_{l=1}^{3^k-2^k} \Omega_l \\ &= \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{2^k-1} \Omega_l\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2^k}^{3^k-2^k} \Omega_l\right) \ , \\ \Omega_l &= \prod_{j=1}^k W_{j,l} \ .\end{aligned}$$

Let now $l < 2^k$. We can write Ω_l as the countable union of an increasing sequence of closed conic subsets of $T^*_{(x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\mathscr{M}^k \smallsetminus 0$

$$\Omega_l = \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \Omega_{l,m} \ , \ \Omega_{l,m} = \prod_{j=1}^k W_{j,l,m} \ ,$$

where

$$W_{j,l,m} = \begin{cases} \complement(V_{+,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x_j) \cup V_{-,g_{\epsilon_m}}(x_j)) \smallsetminus \{0\} & \text{if } W_{j,l} = \complement(\overline{V}_{+,g}(x_j) \cup \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_j)) \ , \\ W_{j,l} & \text{if } W_{j,l} = \overline{V}_{+,g}(x_j) \cup \overline{V}_{-,g}(x_j) \ . \end{cases}$$

If $l \geq 2^k$, Ω_l is already a closed conic subset of $T^*_{(x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\mathscr{M}^k \smallsetminus 0$. Finally, define

$$\Gamma_{k,m}(x_1,\ldots,x_k) = \left(\bigcup_{l=1}^{2^k-1} \Omega_{l,m}\right) \cup \left(\bigcup_{l=2^k}^{3^k-2^k} \Omega_l\right) \ .$$

By construction, $\Gamma_{k,m}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ is a closed conic subset of $T^*_{(x_1,\ldots,x_k)}\mathscr{M}^k \smallsetminus 0$, $\Gamma_{k,m}(x_1,\ldots,x_k) \subset \mathring{\Gamma}_{k,m+1}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$ and

$$\complement(\overline{V}^k_{+,g}(x_1,\ldots,x_k) \cup \overline{V}^k_{-,g}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)) = \bigcup_{m=0}^{\infty} \Gamma_{k,m}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$$

for all $(x_1,\ldots,x_k) \in \mathscr{M}^k$. Taking $\Gamma_{k,m}$ as the disjoint union of the $\Gamma_{k,m}(x_1,\ldots,x_k)$'s for all $(x_1,\ldots,x_k) \in \mathscr{M}^k$ gives the thesis. □

4.0.19. Corollary. *One can write* $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$ *for all* $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ *as the countable inductive limit*

$$\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\mathscr{M}^k, \wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k) = \varinjlim_{m\in\mathbb{N}} \mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k) \tag{91}$$

of the spaces $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$. *Let* $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$ *be endowed with the locally convex inductive limit topology induced by the Hörmander topology on each* $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$ *for all* $k = 1, 2, \ldots$*; then* $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k \to \mathscr{M}^k)$ *is nuclear for all such* k.

Proof. By Lemma 4.0.18, one has the inclusions $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)\subset\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m'}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ for all $m<m'$. Since, given any closed conic subset $\Gamma\subset T^*\mathscr{M}^k\setminus 0$, one can construct $u\in\mathscr{E}'_\Gamma(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ with $WF(u)=\Gamma$ (Theorem 8.1.4, pp. 255–256 of [39]), the above set inclusion is proper for all $m<m'$. For the last statement, we recall that, for any given non-void, closed conic subset Γ of the cotangent bundle minus the range of its zero section, the Hörmander topology on $\mathscr{E}'_\Gamma$ is the initial topology induced by the linear maps $u\mapsto u(f)\in\mathbb{C}$ and $u\mapsto Pu\in\mathscr{D}'$, where f runs through all smooth functions and P runs through all properly supported pseudodifferential operators of order zero with $\mathrm{Char}P\supset\Gamma$, where the characteristic set $\mathrm{Char}P$ of P is the zero set of the principal symbol of P away from the range of the zero section [40]. Therefore, the above inductive limit topology on $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ is strictly finer than the topology induced from $\mathscr{E}'(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$. Since the latter is Hausdorff, we conclude that the former is also Hausdorff. Moreover, since $\mathbb{C}$ is finite-dimensional and $\mathscr{D}'$ is nuclear, it follows from the permanence of nuclearity for initial topologies (Proposition 5.2.3, pp. 92 of [64]) that $\mathscr{E}'_\Gamma$ is nuclear as well. By Proposition 4.2.1, pp. 76 of [43] together with Theorems 5.1.1, pp. 85 and 5.2.2, pp. 91–92 of [64], any Hausdorff countable inductive limit of nuclear locally convex spaces is nuclear. Therefore, $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ must be nuclear for all k, as claimed. ☐

4.0.20. REMARK (Stefan Waldmann, personal communication). We remark that the inclusion

$$\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)\subset\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m+1}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$$

although being a proper injection, is *not* a topological embedding. The reason is the following: the space $\Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ of test densities is dense in the Hörmander topology of $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ for all $m\in\mathbb{N}$. Since by Theorem 8.1.4 of [39] one can find $u_m\in\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m+1}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ which does not belong to $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$, there is a sequence $(v_{n,m}\in\Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k))_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ converging to u_m in the Hörmander topology of $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m+1}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$. If $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ were a closed subspace in this topology, then u_m would have to be an element of this subspace, which is false by assumption. In fact, even more is true: since $\Gamma^\infty_c(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ is dense in the Hörmander topology of $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m+1}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$, so is $\mathscr{E}'_{\Gamma_{k,m}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$. Hence, the inductive limit (91) cannot be a *strict* one.

From now on we tacitly assume that $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$ is endowed with the topology defined in Corollary 4.0.19 for all k. Once this is done, we may proceed to proving the main result of this Subsection.

4.0.21. THEOREM. *Let $\mathscr{U}\subset\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ be open in the compact-open topology, and let $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ be endowed with the initial topology induced by the linear maps*

$$F\mapsto F(\varphi)\in\mathbb{C}\ , \tag{92}$$

$$F\mapsto F^{(k)}[\varphi]\in\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)\ ,\ k=1,2,\dots\ , \tag{93}$$

*with φ running through all elements of $\mathscr{U}$. Then $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ is a nuclear locally convex *-algebra, which becomes even a nuclear locally convex Poisson *-algebra when endowed with the*

Peierls bracket associated to a microlocal generalized Lagrangian of first order on $\mathscr{U}$ *with normally hyperbolic Euler-Lagrange operator. As a consequence, the Poisson *-subalgebra* $\mathscr{F}_0(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ *and the self-adjoint linear subspace* $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})$ *are also nuclear locally convex when endowed with the relative topology.*

Proof. That $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ is a nuclear locally convex space, it follows from the permanence of nuclearity for initial topologies (Proposition 5.2.3, pp. 92 of [64]) together with Corollary 4.0.19. Involution is obviously well-defined, continuous and commutes with the Peierls bracket; Proposition 3.2.15 and Corollary 3.2.14 show that the Peierls bracket $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$ associated to $\mathscr{L}$ is a Lie bracket on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$. Continuity of the Peierls bracket with respect to the topology of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ follows from Corollary 3.1.4 together with the energy estimates proven in the second paper of this series. It remains to check that $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ is closed under products and that this operation is continuous – Leibniz's rule for $\{\cdot,\cdot\}_{\mathscr{L}}$

$$\{F,GH\}_{\mathscr{L}}=\{F,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}H+G\{F,H\}_{\mathscr{L}} \tag{94}$$

will then follow from Leibniz's rule (101) for functional derivatives of pointwise products of functionals (see also the discussion right after Theorem 4.0.22).

Take $F,G\in\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$, and consider their pointwise product $(F\cdot G)(\varphi)=F(\varphi)G(\varphi)$. Now, by Leibniz's rule for derivatives of order k,

$$\begin{aligned}&(F\cdot G)^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_k)\\&\qquad=\sum_{\pi\in\mathscr{P}_k}\sum_{l=0}^{k}F^{(k-l)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_{\pi(1)},\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_{\pi(k-l)})G^{(l)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_{\pi(k-l+1)},\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_{\pi(k)})\ ,\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathscr{P}_k$ is the group of permutations of k elements. By Theorem 8.2.9, pp. 267 of [39], the wave front set of each distribution appearing in the above sum is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{WF}(F^{(k-l)}[\varphi]\otimes G^{(l)}[\varphi])\subset{}&\mathrm{WF}(F^{(k-l)}[\varphi])\times\mathrm{WF}(G^{(l)}[\varphi])\\&\cup\Big(\mathrm{WF}(F^{(k-l)}[\varphi])\times(\mathrm{supp}\,(G^{(l)}[\varphi])\times\{0\})\Big)\\&\cup\Big((\mathrm{supp}\,F^{(k-l)}[\varphi])\times\{0\})\times\mathrm{WF}(G^{(l)}[\varphi])\Big)\ .\end{aligned}$$

By direct inspection the right-hand side in included in the open set $\Upsilon_{k,g}$, as it should. The wave front set of $(F\cdot G)^{(k)}[\varphi]$ is clearly contained in the union of all the wave front sets of the components, which satisfies again the requested bound by the closedness of the wave front sets. Continuity of the product then follows from Schwartz's kernel theorem [43] applied to the nuclear locally convex spaces $\mathscr{E}'_{\Upsilon_{k,g}}(\wedge^{kd}T^*\mathscr{M}^k\to\mathscr{M}^k)$. The last claims follow immediately from the permanence of nuclearity under taking linear subspaces (Proposition 5.1.1, pp. 85 of [64]). □

Actually, one can strengthen Theorem 4.0.21 considerably:

4.0.22. Theorem (Smooth functional calculus). *Given* $F_1,\ldots,F_n\in\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$*, let* $V\subset\mathbb{R}^{2n}\cong\mathbb{C}^n$ *be an open set containing the range of* $(F_1,\ldots,F_n)$*, and let* $\psi:V\to\mathbb{C}$ *be a smooth* *map. Then* $\psi\circ(F_1,\ldots,F_n)\in\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ *with* $\mathrm{supp}\,(\psi\circ(F_1,\ldots,F_n)\subset\cup_{j=1}^n\mathrm{supp}\,F_j$*, and composition with any such* ψ *is continuous.*

Proof. Smoothness of $\psi\circ(F_1,\ldots,F_n)$ follows from Faà di Bruno's formula (104). The validity of the aforementioned support property follows from an argument similar to that used in the proof of Lemma 2.3.3 for products (i.e. $\psi(z_1,z_2)=z_1z_2$), so we are only left with proving that the wave front set of the functional derivative of $\psi\circ(F_1,\ldots,F_n)$ of order k is contained in $\Upsilon_{k,g}$ for all $k\geq 1$. This fact and the continuity of composition with ψ then follow from Faà di Bruno's formula (104) together with an argument similar to that used for products in Theorem 4.0.21. □

In particular, $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ is a $\mathscr{C}^\infty$*-ring* [60]. To our knowledge, this is the first non-trivial example in which such a structure appears in applications outside pure mathematics. Moreover, the Peierls bracket acts as a $\mathscr{C}^\infty$-derivation on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$, that is, if $\psi,F_1,\ldots,F_n$ are as in Theorem 4.0.22 and $G\in\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$, then

(95)

$$\{\psi(F_1,\ldots,F_n),G\}_{\mathscr{L}}=\sum_{j=1}^n\left[\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\Re z_j}(F_1,\ldots,F_n)\{\Re F_j,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}+\frac{\partial\psi}{\partial\Im z_j}(F_1,\ldots,F_n)\{\Im F_j,G\}_{\mathscr{L}}\right]\ .$$

The above formula follows immediately from the chain rule (100) and yields Leibniz's rule for the Peierls bracket as a special case.

A consequence of Theorem 4.0.22 is that the topology of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ given in Corollary 4.0.19 is *not* sequentially complete. To see this, let $F:\mathscr{U}\ni\varphi\mapsto F(\varphi)\doteq\int_{\mathscr{M}}\varphi\omega$, where ω is a smooth real-valued d-form of compact support in $\mathscr{M}$. Let (f_n) be a sequence of even smooth functions $f_n:\mathbb{R}\to[0,1]$ supported in $[-2,2]$ which converges pointwise to the characteristic function $\chi_{[-1,1]}$ of $[-1,1]$ and whose derivatives of all orders converge pointwise to zero (e.g. take $f_n(|x|)=1$ for $|x|\leq 1+(4n)^{-1}$ and $f_n(|x|)=0$ for $|x|\geq 1+(2n)^{-1}$). Defining $F_n\doteq f_n\circ F$ gives a sequence (F_n) of elements of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$, whose functional derivatives of order $k\geq 1$ are given by Faà di Bruno's formula (104) as

$$F_n^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1,\ldots,\vec{\varphi}_k)=f_n^{(k)}(F(\varphi))\left(\int_{\mathscr{M}}\vec{\varphi}_1\omega\right)\cdots\left(\int_{\mathscr{M}}\vec{\varphi}_k\omega\right)\ . \tag{96}$$

Hence, the functional derivatives of all orders of the elements of the sequence (F_n) converge to zero in the respective topologies for all $\varphi\in\mathscr{U}$. The sequence $(F_n(\varphi))$, however, converges pointwise to $\chi_{[-1,1]}\circ F(\varphi)$, which defines a functional on $\mathscr{U}$ which is in general *not even continuous*, let alone microcausal. By the Stone-Weierstrass theorem in the interval $[-2,2]$ [43], there is even a sequence of functionals $F_n\in\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U}\cap F^{-1}((-2,2)))$ which lies in the *-algebra generated by $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U}\cap F^{-1}((-2,2)))$ and converges to $\chi_{[-1,1]}\circ F$ in the topology of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U}\cap F^{-1}((-2,2)))$. It would be desirable to find a stronger topology on $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ which is compatible with its Poisson *-algebraic and $\mathscr{C}^\infty$-ring structures, and (at least sequentially) complete.

Now we recall the important fact that $\mathscr{F}_{\mu\mathrm{loc}}(\mathscr{M},\mathscr{U})\subset\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M},g),\mathscr{U})$ contains the squared Hilbert seminorms

$$\varphi\mapsto F_{k,f}(\varphi)=\|\varphi\|^2_{2,k,f}\ ,$$

defined in (5), for all $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. This fact, together with Theorem 4.0.22, yields:

4.0.23. Proposition. *The following facts hold true:*

(i) *Given any open set* $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *in the compact-open topology and* $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$, *there is* $F \in \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))$ *such that* $F(\varphi_0) = 1$, $0 \leq F \leq 1$, *and* $F \equiv 0$ *in* $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \smallsetminus \mathscr{U}$. *In particular, one can completely recover the compact-open topology of* $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *from the complements of zero sets of elements of* $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))$.

(ii) *Any* $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *open in the compact-open topology admits locally finite partitions of unity whose elements belong to* $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$.

(iii) *Given any open set* $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *in the compact-open topology, the algebra* $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$ *separates the points of* $\mathscr{U}$, *that is, for any* $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathscr{U}$ *there is an* $F \in \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$ *such that* $F(\varphi_1) \neq F(\varphi_2)$.

(iv) *Given any open set* $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *in the compact-open topology, any unital *-morphism* $\omega : \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U}) \to \mathbb{C}$ *(i.e. a* *-character *on* $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$*) is given by the evaluation functional at some* $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ *(by (iii),* φ *must be unique).*

(v) *Given any open sets* $\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ *in the compact-open topology, any continuous unital *-morphism* $\alpha : \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U}) \to \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{V})$ *is the pullback of a unique smooth map* $\alpha^* : \mathscr{V} \to \mathscr{U}$.

Proof. (i) Let $\chi : \mathbb{R} \to [0, 1]$ be an even smooth function such that $\chi(t) = 0$ for $|t| \geq 1$ and $\chi(t) = 1$ $|t| \leq \frac{1}{2}$. There are $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ and $R > 0$ such that $\varphi_0 \in \{\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) : F_{k,f}(\varphi - \varphi_0) < R^2\} \subset \mathscr{U}$. Set $F(\varphi) = \chi(R^{-2}F_{k,f}(\varphi - \varphi_0))$, and we are done by Theorem 4.0.22.

(ii) Recall that, since $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is a nuclear Fréchet space, it follows that $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is separable, hence second countable and Lindelöf. $\mathscr{U}$ is then a second countable metric space, hence also separable and Lindelöf. Since (i) holds, the result then follows from Theorem 16.10, pp. 171–172 of [51].

(iii) $\mathscr{U}$ is Hausdorff, hence the result follows immediately from (i).

(iv) By the proof of (ii), we know that $\mathscr{U}$ is Lindelöf. Since (i) implies that $\mathscr{U}$ is completely regular, it follows that it must be *realcompact*, that is, any $\mathbb{R}$-algebra homomorphism from the $\mathbb{R}$-valued continuous functions on $\mathscr{U}$ into $\mathbb{R}$ is given by evaluation at some $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$ (see [29], Theorem 3.11.12, pp. 216). The result then follows for the $\mathbb{R}$-subalgebra of real-valued elements of $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$ by combining (ii) with Theorem 17.6, pp. 187–188, Remark 18.1, pp. 188–189 and Proposition 18.3, pp. 191 of [51]. The general case is immediate.

(v) Notice that the pullback of any *-character by α is also a *-character, hence by (iii)-(iv) α^* as above is really the pullback by α (thus also justifying our notation). Moreover, the action of α on functionals of the form $\mathscr{U} \ni \varphi \mapsto \int_{\mathscr{M}} f\varphi \mathrm{d}\mu_g$, $f \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, shows that α^* must be smooth on $\mathscr{V}$.

□

Some comments about the meaning of Proposition 4.0.23 are in order. Proposition 4.0.23 (ii) shows that we can "glue together" microcausal functionals defined on an open covering of

$\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, that is, the assignment

$$\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \text{ open } \to \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U}) \ , \tag{97}$$

together with the restriction morphisms induced by inclusions between pairs of open subsets in $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ in the compact-open topology, constitute a *sheaf* of *-algebras over the topological space $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$. However, multiplying $F \in \mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$ by a "bump" functional as given by Proposition 4.0.23 (i) improves the localization of F in field configuration space at the cost of *losing* information about the *space-time* support of F. This must be kept in mind when multiplying F by the elements of a partition of unity on $\mathscr{U}$ belonging to $\mathscr{F}((\mathscr{M}, g), \mathscr{U})$. A more conceptual discussion of the interplay between these two notions of localization will take place in the third paper of the series.

5. Final considerations

We have presented the very first steps into a novel, algebraic approach to classical field theory in which the main role is played by algebras of functionals over sets of field configurations on any globally hyperbolic space-time.

As a whole, our formalism can be extended to field theories living on any fiber bundle over space-time. In fact, extensions of parts of our framework have already appeared in the literature, including fermion fields [66], Yang-Mills models and gravity [31, 77]. These works also show that our formalism is capable of dealing with Lagrangians possessing local symmetries which constrain the dynamics – more precisely, a rigorous version of the classical Batalin-Vilkoviskiĭ approach to gauge theories can be provided within our setup [31]. Such subtleties are absent in the case of real scalar fields, which do not possess any "internal" structure. A full account of our framework encompassing all the above examples will be pursued in the future, outside the present series.

On a more technical side, treating the above examples will occasionally require (particularly in the case of fermion fields) extending the results concerning normally hyperbolic linear partial differential operators presented in this series of papers to more general hyperbolic systems. Theorem 3.2.3 and the energy estimates to be found in the second paper of this series can be extended to symmetrizable, first-order hyperbolic systems with very few changes in the arguments (as done, for instance, in [17] and the appendix to [47]). Arguably, Theorem 3.2.4 could be reworked along the lines of the paper of Dencker [24] to encompass symmetrizable, first-order hyperbolic systems of real principal type, of which the Dirac operator is an example [66]. One could try to go even further and encompass the case of second-order regularly hyperbolic systems of Christodoulou [19], but the microlocal analysis of such systems is severely underdeveloped, due to the possibility of occurrence of bicharacteristics with varying multiplicity (e.g. birefringence in crystal optics; see [54] for the state of the art on these matters).

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Prof. Frank Michael Forger for a critical reading of an early version of the Introduction, as well as for invaluable advice on the mathematical literature on classical field theory and general presentation details. We are specially grateful to him for discussions on physically relevant functionals, which led to most of the examples presented in Subsection 2.3. We would also like to thank Prof. Stefan Waldmann for pointing out a mistake in the proof of Corollary 4.0.19 in a previous version of the present paper, and also for his clarifying comments.

The junior author (P.L.R.) would like to thank the hospitality of the II. Institut für theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg, the Dipartimento di Matematica, Facoltà di Scienze della Università di Trento, and the Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, University of São Paulo, where most of the work presented in this paper was developed.

Appendix A. A short review of differential calculus on locally convex topological vector spaces

In this Appendix we list the basic definitions and results of differential calculus we need. Our basic references are [37] and [51], to whom we refer for more details and proofs. The first reference works only with Fréchet spaces, but the proofs of the results quoted below work in the general case with little or no change.

The notion of differentiability of curves in locally convex topological vector spaces is straightforward.

A.0.1. Definition. Let $\gamma : (a,b) \to \mathscr{F}$, $a < b \in \mathbb{R} \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be a continuous curve into a locally convex topological vector space $\mathscr{F}$. We say that γ is a $\mathscr{C}^1$ *curve* if for all $t \in (a,b)$ the limit

$$\gamma'(t) \doteq \lim_{s\to 0} \frac{1}{s}(\gamma(t+s) - \gamma(t))$$

exists and defines a *continuous* curve $\gamma' : (a,b) \to \mathscr{F}$ (continuity of γ actually follows from these conditions alone, hence it does not hurt to assume it from the start). We also say that γ is a $\mathscr{C}^m$ curve, $m \geq 1$, if $\gamma^{(k)} \doteq (\gamma^{(k-1)})'$ exists and is continuous for all $1 \leq k \leq m$, where $\gamma^{(0)} \doteq \gamma$. If γ is a $\mathscr{C}^m$ curve for all m, we say that γ is a *smooth* curve.

We stress that there would be no loss of generality if we required the domain of smooth curves to be the whole real line: by the chain rule (100), $\gamma : (a,b) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is smooth if and only if $\gamma \circ f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is smooth for any diffeomorphism $f : \mathbb{R} \to (a,b)$ (e.g. $f(\lambda) = \frac{b+a}{2} + \frac{b-a}{2}\tanh(\lambda)$). Once this is said, let us see how Definition A.0.1 is realized in the concrete cases that interest us.

- $\mathscr{F} = \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ (endowed with the compact-open topology): $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{F}$ is smooth if and only if $\gamma(\lambda)(p) = \Phi(\lambda, p)$ for all $(\lambda, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{M}$, where $\Phi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{M})$;
- $\mathscr{F} = \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ (endowed with the usual inductive limit topology): $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{F}$ is smooth if and only if $\gamma(\lambda)(p) = \Phi(\lambda, p)$ for all $(\lambda, p) \in \mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{M}$, where $\Phi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathbb{R} \times \mathscr{M})$ is such that for any $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$ there is a compact subset $K \subset \mathscr{M}$ such that $\Phi(\lambda, p) = \Phi(a, p)$ for all $p \notin K$, $\lambda \in [a,b]$.

The notion of smooth curves allows one to introduce another topology on $\mathscr{F}$, given by the final topology induced by $\mathbb{R}$ through all smooth curves $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{F}$. We call this topology the c^∞-topology on $\mathscr{F}$. This topology is necessarily finer than the original one, but it is not in general a vector space topology – the finest locally convex vector space topology on $\mathscr{F}$ that is coarser then the c^∞ topology is the bornologification of $\mathscr{F}$'s original topology. The c^∞- and the original locally convex vector space topologies coincide if $\mathscr{F}$ is, for example, a Fréchet space (such as $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$), but are distinct for $\mathscr{F} = \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ if $\mathscr{M}$ is non-compact. The latter case is also an example where the c^∞ topology fails to be a vector space topology.

Given two locally convex vector spaces $\mathscr{F}_1$, $\mathscr{F}_2$, $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{F}_1$ c^∞-open, we say that a map $\Phi : \mathscr{U} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ is *conveniently smooth* if $\Phi \circ \gamma$ is a smooth curve on $\mathscr{F}_2$ for every smooth curve $\gamma : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{U}$. We stress that conveniently smooth maps need not even be continuous (see [34] for a counterexample). A simple non-trivial example of a conveniently smooth map $\Phi : \mathscr{F} \to \mathscr{F}$ is, of course, the translation $\varphi \mapsto \Phi(\varphi) = \varphi + \varphi_0$ by a fixed element $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{F}$. In particular, the coordinate change maps $\kappa_{\varphi_2} \circ \kappa^{-1}_{\varphi_1} : \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ in the affine flat manifold $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ (endowed with the Whitney topology) are conveniently smooth for all $\varphi_1, \varphi_2 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ such that $\varphi_1 - \varphi_2 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. This shows that the atlas $\mathfrak{U}$ defined in (7) induces a smooth structure on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$; the corresponding smooth manifold topology is, of course, the manifold topology generated by the c^∞-open subsets of the modelling vector space $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, which is even finer than the Whitney topology. The connected components of this topology are, however, also of the form $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M}) + \varphi_0$, $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$; therefore, the smooth curves in $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ with respect to the smooth structure induced by the atlas $\mathfrak{U}$ must be of the form $\mathbb{R} \ni \lambda \mapsto \gamma(\lambda) = \varphi_0 + \gamma_0(\lambda)$, where $\gamma_0 : \mathbb{R} \to \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ is smooth. Hence, it is just fair to say that such γ is *a smooth curve with respect to the Whitney topology*, and the smooth structure induced by the atlas $\mathfrak{U}$, *the smooth structure on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ induced by the Whitney topology.*

A.0.2. Remark. It can be shown [51] that, for $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ endowed with the smooth structure induced by the Whitney topology, the bundles

$$T^{r,s}\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) = (\otimes^s T^*\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})) \otimes (\otimes^r T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}))$$

of tensors of contravariant rank r and covariant rank s are given at each $\varphi \in \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ by the space of bounded linear mappings from $\otimes^s_\beta \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ to $\otimes^r_\beta \mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$. Here $\otimes_\beta$ denotes the *bornological* tensor product, whose topology is the finest locally convex topology on the algebraic tensor product such that the canonical quotient map is *bounded*; this topology is finer than the projective tensor product topology. Nonetheless, $T\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ and $T^*\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ assume the form given in Subsection 2.2, since $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$ is bornological [43]. It also turns out that the nuclearity and completeness of $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c(\mathscr{M})$, together with Theorems 6.14, pp. 72–73 and 28.7, pp. 280–281 of [51], imply that every kinematical tangent vector on $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$ is also an *operational* one, i.e. it defines a point derivation on (conveniently) smooth maps $F : \mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M}) \to \mathbb{R}$.

In principle, we could develop essentially all tools of differential calculus by using convenient smoothness. However, for the purposes of this paper, it is often preferrable to use a stronger concept of smoothness. Such a notion is provided, for instance, by Michal [57] and Bastiani [4]. This is also the notion employed in the accounts of infinite dimensional differential calculus done by Milnor [59] and Hamilton [37], and all the basic results of Calculus we present in the remainder of this Appendix are formulated in this context (see, however, Remark A.0.4 below). The basic definition is as follows (See also Definition 2.3.7 for the special case of real-valued maps):

A.0.3. Definition. Let $\mathscr{F}_1, \mathscr{F}_2$ be locally convex topological vector spaces, $\mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{F}_1$ open, and $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ a continuous map. We say that F is *(Michal-Bastiani-)differentiable of order* m if for all $k = 1, \ldots, m$ the k-th order directional (Gâteaux) derivatives

$$F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k) \doteq \frac{\partial^k}{\partial\lambda_1 \cdots \partial\lambda_k}\Big|_{\lambda_1=\cdots=\lambda_k=0} F\left(\varphi + \sum_{j=1}^{k} \lambda_j \vec{\varphi}_j\right) \tag{98}$$

exist as jointly continuous maps from $\mathscr{U} \times \mathscr{F}_1^k \ni (\varphi, \vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k)$ to $\mathscr{F}_2$. If F is differentiable of order m for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$, we say that F is *(Michal-Bastiani-)smooth.*[5]

The right-hand side of formula (98) should be understood as the differentiation of a k-parameter curve taking values in $\mathscr{F}_2$, for fixed $\varphi, \vec{\varphi}_1, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}_k$. The argument of F inside the limit is guaranteed to lie inside $\mathscr{U}$ for sufficiently small $\lambda_1, \ldots, \lambda_k$.

Given $\mathscr{U}$ an *arbitrary* (i.e. not necessarily open) subset of $\mathscr{C}^\infty(\mathscr{M})$, we say that a continuous map $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ is differentiable of order m (resp. smooth) if there is $\mathscr{V} \supset \mathscr{U}$ open in the compact-open topology and a functional $\tilde{F} : \mathscr{V} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ extending F (i.e. $\tilde{F}|_{\mathscr{U}} = F$) such that $\tilde{F}$ is differentiable of order m (resp. smooth). For completely arbitrary $\mathscr{U}$, the derivatives of F on $\mathscr{U}$ depend on the choice of extension $\tilde{F}$ (take for instance $\mathscr{U} = \{\varphi\}$ for some $\varphi \in \mathscr{F}_1$). However, if $\mathscr{U}$ happens to have a nonvoid interior, then it is easily shown that the derivatives of F on $\mathscr{U}$ do not depend on the choice of extension. Under certain conditions on F, one can weaken this condition (see, for instance, Remark 2.3.9).

A.0.4. Remark. For Mackey-complete locally convex topological vector spaces (also called c^∞-*complete* or *convenient* topological vector spaces), convenient smoothness enjoys all the rules of Calculus presented in the remainder of this Appendix assuming Michal-Bastiani differentiability. Moreover, for convenient topological vector spaces whose c^∞ topology coincides with the original topology, such as Fréchet spaces, convenient and Michal-Bastiani smoothness coincide.

Let $\gamma : [a, b] \to \mathscr{F}$, $a < b \in \mathbb{R}$, be a continuous curve segment in the locally convex topological vector space $\mathscr{F}$. We can define the *(Riemann) integral* of γ along $[a, b]$

$$\int_a^b \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda \in \mathscr{F}$$

as the unique linear map from the space $\mathscr{C}([a, b], \mathscr{F})$ of continuous curves from $[a, b]$ to $\mathscr{F}$ into the space $\mathscr{F}$ such that:

1. For any continuous linear functional $u : \mathscr{F} \to \mathbb{R}$, we have that $u\left(\int_a^b \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda\right) = \int_a^b u(\gamma(\lambda))\mathrm{d}\lambda$;
2. For any continuous seminorm $\|\cdot\|$ on $\mathscr{F}$, we have that $\left\|\int_a^b \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda\right\| \leq \int_a^b \|\gamma(\lambda)\|\mathrm{d}\lambda$;
3. If $a < c < b \in \mathbb{R}$, then $\int_a^b \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda = \int_a^c \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda + \int_c^b \gamma(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda$.

The *fundamental theorem of Calculus* holds for the Riemann integral of curves taking values in $\mathscr{F}$:

---

[5] Michal-Bastiani differentiability and smoothness are respectively listed in Keller's treatise [44] as "$\mathscr{C}^k_c$- and $\mathscr{C}^\infty_c$-differentiability". Here we avoid his nomenclature, for it clashes with the usual notation for differentiable and smooth functions of compact support.

A.0.5. THEOREM ([37], Theorems 2.2.3 and 2.2.2). *Let $\gamma_0 : [a,b] \to \mathscr{F}$ be a continuous curve, $a \leq t \leq b$, and define $\gamma_1(t) \doteq \int_a^t \gamma_0(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda$. Then $\gamma_1 : [a,b] \to \mathscr{F}$ is a $\mathscr{C}^1$ curve, and $\gamma_1'(t) = \gamma_0(t)$. Conversely, if $\gamma_1 : [a,b] \to \mathscr{F}$ is a $\mathscr{C}^1$ curve, then $\gamma_1(b) - \gamma_1(a) = \int_a^b \gamma_1'(\lambda)\mathrm{d}\lambda$.* □

A.0.6. COROLLARY ([37], Theorem 3.2.2). *Let $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ be a continuous map as in Definition A.0.1, $\varphi_0 \in \mathscr{U}$, and $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{U} - \varphi_0 \doteq \{\varphi - \varphi_0 \in \mathscr{F} : \varphi \in \mathscr{U}\}$. Assume that $\mathscr{U}$ is convex for simplicity. If F is differentiable of order one, then*

$$F(\varphi_0 + \vec{\varphi}) - F(\varphi_0) = \int_0^1 F^{(1)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi})\mathrm{d}\lambda \ . \tag{99}$$

□

With the aid of the fundamental theorem of Calculus A.0.5, the following key results can be proven. First, the *chain rule* holds:

A.0.7. THEOREM ([37], Theorem 3.3.4). *Let $F : \mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{F}_1 \to \mathscr{F}_2$, $G : \mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{F}_2 \to \mathscr{F}_3$ be respectively continuous maps from open subsets $\mathscr{U}, \mathscr{V}$ of locally convex topological vector spaces $\mathscr{F}_1, \mathscr{F}_2$ into $\mathscr{F}_2$ and the locally convex topological vector space $\mathscr{F}_3$, such that $F(\mathscr{U}) \subset \mathscr{V}$. If F (resp. G) is once differentiable on $\mathscr{U}$ (resp. $\mathscr{V}$), then for all $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$, $\vec{\varphi} \in \mathscr{F}_1$ we have that*

$$(G \circ F)^{(1)}(\varphi)(\vec{\varphi}) = G^{(1)}[F(\varphi)](F^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi})) \ . \tag{100}$$

□

The chain rule (100) yields, after taking direct sums, the *Leibniz's rule* for derivatives of composition of n-tuples of maps $F_1, \ldots, F_n$ with a continuous k-linear map ψ

$$(\psi(F_1, \ldots, F_n))^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \psi(F_1[\varphi], \ldots, F_j^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}), \ldots, F_n[\varphi]) \ . \tag{101}$$

This, together with the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99), yields the *integration by parts formula* and, even more importantly, *Taylor's formula with (integral) remainder*

$$F(\varphi_0 + \vec{\varphi}) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \frac{1}{j!} F^{(k)}[\varphi_0](\vec{\varphi}, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}) + \int_0^1 \frac{(1-\lambda)^k}{k!} F^{(k+1)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi}, \ldots, \vec{\varphi})\mathrm{d}\lambda \ . \tag{102}$$

To see this, note that Leibniz's rule implies the following key formula:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(1-\lambda)^{k-1}}{(k-1)!} F^{(k)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi}, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}) &= \frac{(1-\lambda)^k}{k!} F^{(k+1)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi}, \ldots, \vec{\varphi}) \\ &\quad - \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\lambda}\left[\frac{(1-\lambda)^k}{k!} F^{(k)}[\varphi_0 + \lambda\vec{\varphi}](\vec{\varphi}, \ldots, \vec{\varphi})\right] \ . \end{aligned} \tag{103}$$

Integrating both sides of formula (103) from $\lambda = 0$ to $\lambda = 1$ by means of the fundamental theorem of Calculus (99) yields the fundamental induction step from $k-1$ to k. Since the case $k = 1$ of (102) is settled by the fundamental theorem of Calculus itself, we are done.

For the convenience of the reader, we prove the generalization of the chain rule (100) for higher derivatives, since this proof is not easy to find in the literature at the present level of generality. We follow the argument employed in [45].

A.0.8. Corollary (Faà di Bruno's formula). *Let $F : \mathscr{U} \subset \mathscr{F}_1 \to \mathscr{F}_2$, $G : \mathscr{V} \subset \mathscr{F}_2 \to \mathscr{F}_3$ satisfy the hypotheses of Theorem A.0.7. If F (resp. G) is m-times differentiable on $\mathscr{U}$ (resp. $\mathscr{V}$), then $G \circ F$ is also m-times differentiable on $\mathscr{U}$, and for all $1 \leq k \leq m$,*

$$(G \circ F)^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) = \sum_{\pi \in P_k} G^{(|\pi|)}[F(\varphi)] \left(\bigotimes_{I \in \pi} F^{(|I|)}[\varphi](\otimes_{j \in I} \vec{\varphi}_j) \right) , \tag{104}$$

where P_k is the set of all partitions $\pi = \{I_1, \dots, I_l\}$ of $\{1, \dots, k\}$, that is, $I_j \neq \varnothing$, $I_j \cap I_{j'} = \varnothing$ for $j \neq j'$ and $\cup_{j=1}^{l} I_j = \{1, \dots, k\}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on k. The case $k = 1$ is just the usual chain rule (100). Assume that the formula is valid up to order $k-1$ along $\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_{k-1}$. Then for each partition π of $\{1, \dots, k-1\}$ in the above sum we have, by Leibniz's rule (101),

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[G^{(|\pi|)} \circ F \left(\bigotimes_{I \in \pi} F^{(|I|)}(\otimes_{j \in I} \vec{\varphi}_j) \right) \right]^{(1)} [\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_k) \\
&\qquad = G^{(|\pi|+1)}[F(\varphi)] \left(F^{(1)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_k) \otimes \bigotimes_{I \in \pi} F^{(|I|)}[\varphi](\otimes_{j \in I} \vec{\varphi}_j) \right) \\
&\qquad + \sum_{I' \in \pi} G^{(|\pi|)}[F(\varphi)] \left(F^{(|I'|+1)}[\varphi] \left(\vec{\varphi}_k \otimes \bigotimes_{j \in I'} \vec{\varphi}_j \right) \otimes \bigotimes_{I \in \pi \smallsetminus \{I'\}} F^{(|I|)}[\varphi](\otimes_{l \in I} \vec{\varphi}_l) \right) .
\end{aligned}$$

However, any partition π' of $\{1, \dots, k\}$ is either of the form $\pi' = \{\{k\}\} \cup \pi$ or $\pi' = (\pi \smallsetminus \{I'\}) \cup \{I' \cup \{k\}\}$ for some $I' \in \pi$, $\pi \in P_{k-1}$. Hence, summing the above identities over all such π gives the desired result. □

A consequence of Faà di Bruno's formula (104) is the generalization of Leibniz's rule (101) for higher order derivatives. Finally, one can show that the order of differentiation for higher order derivatives is irrelevant:

A.0.9. Theorem ([37], Theorem 3.6.2). *Let $F : \mathscr{U} \to \mathscr{F}_2$ be a continuous map as in Definition A.0.1. If F is differentiable of order m, then $F^{(k)}[\varphi] : \mathscr{F}_1^k \ni (\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) \mapsto F^{(k)}[\varphi](\vec{\varphi}_1, \dots, \vec{\varphi}_k) \in \mathscr{F}_2$ is a symmetric, k-linear map for all fixed $\varphi \in \mathscr{U}$.* □

References

[1] R. Abraham, J. E. Marsden, *Foundations of Mechanics, Second Edition* (Addison-Wesley, 1978).

[2] I. M. Anderson, *The Variational Bicomplex.* Technical report, Utah State University, 1989 (`http://www.math.usu.edu/~fg_mp/Publications/VB/vb.pdf`)

[3] C. Bär, N. Ginoux, F. Pfäffle, *Wave Equations on Lorentzian Manifolds and Quantization* (European Mathematical Society, 2007).

[4] A. Bastiani, *Applications Différentiables et Varietés Différentiables de Dimension Infinie.* J. Anal. Math. **13** (1964) 1–114.

[5] A. N. Bernal, M. Sánchez, *On Smooth Cauchy Hypersurfaces and Geroch's Splitting Theorem.* Commun. Math. Phys. **243** (2003) 461–470. `arXiv:gr-qc/0306108`.

[6] A. N. Bernal, M. Sánchez, *Smoothness of Time Functions and the Metric Splitting of Globally Hyperbolic Spacetimes.* Commun. Math. Phys. **257** (2005) 43–50. `arXiv:gr-qc/0401112`.

[7] A. N. Bernal, M. Sánchez, *Further Results on the Smoothability of Cauchy Hypersurfaces and Cauchy Time Functions*. Lett. Math. Phys. **77** (2006) 183–197. `arXiv:gr-qc/0512095`.

[8] A. N. Bernal, M. Sánchez, *Globally Hyperbolic Spacetimes can be Defined as "Causal" instead of "Strongly Causal"*. Clas. Quantum Grav. **24** (2007) 745–749. `arXiv:gr-qc/0611138`.

[9] E. Binz, J. Śniatycki, H. Fischer, *Geometry of Classical Fields* (North-Holland, 1988; reprinted by Dover, 2006).

[10] R. Bott, L. W. Tu, *Differential Forms in Algebraic Topology* (Springer-Verlag, 1982).

[11] F. Brennecke, M. Dütsch, *Removal of Violations of the Master Ward Identity in Perturbative QFT*. Rev. Math. Phys. **20** (2008) 119–172. `arXiv:0705.3160 [hep-th]`.

[12] R. Brunetti, M. Dütsch, K. Fredenhagen, *Perturbative Algebraic Quantum Field Theory and Renormalization Groups*. Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **13** (2009) 1541–1599. `arXiv:0901.2038 [math-ph]`.

[13] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, *Microlocal Analysis and Interacting Quantum Field Theories: Renormalization on Physical Backgrounds*. Commun. Math. Phys. **208** (2000) 623–661. `arXiv:math-ph/9903028`.

[14] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, *Quantum Field Theory on Curved Backgrounds*. In: C. Bär, K. Fredenhagen (eds.), *Quantum Field Theory on Curved Spacetimes: Concepts and Mathematical Foundations*. Lecture Notes in Physics **786** (Springer-Verlag, 2009), pp. 129–155. `arXiv:0901.2063 [math-ph]`.

[15] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, M. Köhler, *The Microlocal Spectrum Condition and Wick Polynomials of Free Fields on Curved Spacetimes*. Commun. Math. Phys. **180** (1996) 633–652. `arXiv:gr-qc/9510056`.

[16] R. Brunetti, K. Fredenhagen, R. Verch, *The Generally Covariant Locality Principle: a New Paradigm for Local Quantum Physics*. Commun. Math. Phys. **237** (2003) 31–68. `arXiv:math-ph/0112041`.

[17] R. L. Bryant, P. A. Griffiths, D. Yang, *Characteristics and Existence of Isometric Embeddings*. Duke Math. J. **50** (1983) 893–994.

[18] J. F. Cariñena, M. Crampin, L. A. Ibort, *On the Multisymplectic Formalism for First Order Field Theories*. Diff. Geom. Appl. **1** (1991) 345–374.

[19] D. Christodoulou, *The Action Principle and Partial Differential Equations* (Princeton University Press, 2000).

[20] K. Costello, *Renormalization and Effective Field Theory* (American Mathematical Society, 2011).

[21] C. Crnković, E. Witten, *Covariant Description of Canonical Formalism in Geometrical Theories*. In: S. W. Hawking, W. Israel (eds.), *Three Hundred Years of Gravitation* (Cambridge University Press, 1987), pp. 676–684.

[22] T. de Donder, *Théorie Invariante du Calcul des Variations* (Gauthier-Villars, 1935).

[23] B. S. DeWitt, *The Spacetime Approach to Quantum Field Theory*. In: B. S. DeWitt, R. Stora (eds.), Les Houches Session XL, *Relativity, Groups and Topology II* (North-Holland, 1983), pp. 382–738.

[24] N. Dencker, *On The Propagation of Polarizartion Sets for Systems of Real Principal Type*. J. Funct. Anal. **46** (1982) 351–372.

[25] J. Dimock, *Algebras of Local Observables on a Manifold*. Commun. Math. Phys. **77** (1980) 219–228.

[26] J. J. Duistermaat, *Fourier Integral Operators* (Birkhäuser, 1996).

[27] M. Dütsch, K. Fredenhagen, *The Master Ward Identity and Generalized Schwinger-Dyson Equation in Classical Field Theory*. Commun. Math. Phys. **243** (2003) 275–314. `arXiv:hep-th/0211242`.

[28] M. Dütsch, K. Fredenhagen, *Causal Perturbation Theory in Terms of Retarded Products, and a Proof of the Action Ward Identity*. Rev. Math. Phys. **16** (2004) 1291–1348. `arXiv:hep-th/0501228`.

[29] R. Engelking, *General Topology. Revised and Completed Edition* (Heldermann Verlag, 1989).

[30] M. Forger, S. V. Romero, *Covariant Poisson Brackets in Geometric Field Theory*. Commun. Math. Phys. **256** (2005) 375–410. `arXiv:math-ph/0408008`.

[31] K. Fredenhagen, K. Rejzner, *Batalin-Vilkovisky Formalism in the Functional Approach to Classical Field Theory*. Preprint (2011). `arXiv:1101.5112 [math-ph]`.

[32] A. Frölicher, A. Kriegl, *Linear Spaces and Differentiation Theory* (Wiley, 1988).

[33] R. Geroch, *Domain of Dependence*. J. Math. Phys. **11** (1970) 437–449.

[34] H. Glöckner, *Discontinuous Non-linear Mappings on Locally Convex Direct Limits.* Publ. Math. Debrecen **68**, (2006) 1–13. `arXiv:math/0503387`.

[35] M. J. Gotay, *A Multisymplectic Framework for Classical Field Theory and the Calculus of Variations.* In: M. Francaviglia (ed.), *Mechanics, Analysis and Geometry: 200 Years after Lagrange* (North-Holland, 1991), pp. 203–235. Available at the author's homepage (`http://www.pims.math.ca/~gotay/Multi_I.pdf`).

[36] R. Haag, *Local Quantum Physics – Fields, Particles, Algebras. Second Edition* (Springer-Verlag, 1996).

[37] R. S. Hamilton, *The Inverse Function Theorem of Nash and Moser.* Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.) **7** (1982) 65–222.

[38] S. W. Hawking, G. F. R. Ellis, *The Large Scale Structure of Space-Time* (Cambridge University Press, 1973).

[39] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators I – Distribution Theory and Fourier Analysis. Second Edition* (Springer-Verlag, 1990).

[40] L. Hörmander, *The Analysis of Linear Partial Differential Operators III – Pseudodifferential Operators. Second Edition* (Springer-Verlag, 1994).

[41] L. Hörmander, *Lectures on Nonlinear Hyperbolic Differential Operators.* Mathématiques & Applications **26** (Springer-Verlag, 1997).

[42] S. Jakobs, *Eichbrücken in der klassichen Feldtheorie.* Diplomarbeit, Universität Hamburg (2009). `http://www-library.desy.de/preparch/desy/thesis/desy-thesis-09-009.pdf`

[43] H. Jarchow, *Locally Convex Spaces* (B. G. Teubner Stuttgart, 1981).

[44] H. H. Keller, *Differential Calculus in Locally Convex Spaces.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **417** (Springer-Verlag, 1974).

[45] K. J. Keller, *Dimensional Regularization in Position Space and a Forest Formula for Regularized Epstein-Glaser Renormalization.* PhD Thesis, Universität Hamburg (2010).

[46] J. Kijowski, *A Finite-Dimensional Canonical Formalism in the Classical Field Theory.* Commun. Math. Phys. **30** (1973) 99–128.

[47] S. Klainerman, *Global Existence for Nonlinear Wave Equations.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **33** (1980) 43–101.

[48] I. Kolář, *A Geometrical Version of the Higher Order Hamilton Formalism in Fibered Manifolds.* J. Geom. Phys. **1** (1984) 127–137.

[49] I. Kolář, P. W. Michor, J. Slovák, *Natural Operations in Differential Geometry* (Springer-Verlag, 1993).

[50] I. S. Krasil'shchik, V. V. Lychagin, A. M. Vinogradov, *Geometry of Jet Spaces and Nonlinear Partial Differential Equations* (Gordon and Breach, 1986).

[51] A. Kriegl, P. W. Michor, *The Convenient Setting of Global Analysis* (American Mathematical Society, 1997).

[52] D. E. Lerner, *The Space of Lorentz Metrics.* Commun. Math. Phys. **32** (1973) 19–38.

[53] P. Leyland, J. E. Roberts, *The Cohomology of Nets over Minkowski Space.* Commun. Math. Phys. **62** (1978) 173–189.

[54] O. Liess, *Conical Refractions and Higher Microlocalization.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1555** (Springer-Verlag, 1993).

[55] A. Majda, *Compressible Fluid Flow and Systems of Conservation Laws in Several Space Variables* (Springer-Verlag, 1984).

[56] D. Marolf, *The Generalized Peierls Bracket.* Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **236** (1994) 392–412.

[57] A. D. Michal, *Differential Calculus in Linear Topological Spaces.* Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. **24** (1938) 340–342.

[58] P. W. Michor, *Manifolds of Differentiable Mappings* (Shiva Publishing, 1980). Available at the author's homepage (`http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~michor/manifolds_of_differentiable_mappings.pdf`).

[59] J. Milnor, *Remarks on Infinite-Dimensional Lie Groups.* In: B. DeWitt, R. Stora (eds.), Les Houches Session XL, *Relativity, Groups and Topology II* (North-Holland, 1984), pp. 1007–1057.

[60] I. Moerdijk, G. E. Reyes, *Models for Smooth Infinitesimal Analysis* (Springer-Verlag, 1991).

[61] O. Müller, M. Sánchez, *Lorentzian Manifolds Isometrically Embeddable in* $\mathbb{L}^N$. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **363** (2011) 5367–5379. `arXiv:0812.4439 [math]`.

[62] J. Peetre, *Une Charactérisation Abstraite des Opérateurs Différentiels.* Math. Scand. **7** (1959) 211–218. Erratum: *ibid.* **8** (1960) 116–120.

[63] R. E. Peierls, *The Commutation Laws of Relativistic Field Theory.* Proc. Roy. Soc. London **A214** (1952) 143–157.

[64] A. Pietsch, *Nuclear Locally Convex Spaces* (Springer-Verlag, 1972).

[65] M. M. Rao, *Local Functionals.* In: D. Kolzow (ed.), *Measure Theory, Oberwolfach 1979.* Lecture Notes in Mathematics **794** (Springer-Verlag, 1980), pp. 484–496.

[66] K. Rejzner, *Fermionic Fields in the Functional Approach to Classical Field Theory.* Preprint (2011). `arXiv:1101.5126 [math-ph]`.

[67] W. M. Seiler, *Involution – The Formal Theory of Differential Equations and its Applications in Computer Algebra* (Springer-Verlag, 2010).

[68] U. Seip, *A Convenient Setting for Differential Calculus.* J. Pure Appl. Algebra *14* (1979) 73–100.

[69] J. Slovák, *Peetre Theorem for Nonlinear Operators.* Ann. Global Anal. Geom. **6** (1988) 273–283.

[70] C. D. Sogge, *Lectures on Non-Linear Wave Equations. Second Edition* (International Press, 2008).

[71] I. Vaisman, *Lectures on the Geometry of Poisson Manifolds* (Birkhäuser, 1994).

[72] A. M. Vinogradov, *On the Algebro-Geometric Foundations of Lagrangian Field Theory.* Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **236** (1977) 284–287; English translation in Sov. Math. Dokl. **18** (1977) 1200–1204.

[73] A. M. Vinogradov, *A Spectral Sequence Associated with a Nonlinear Differential Equation, and Algebro-Geometric Foundations of Lagrangian Field Theory with Constraints.* Dokl. Akad. Nauk SSSR **238** (1978) 1028–1031; English translation in Sov. Math. Dokl. **19** (1978) 144–148.

[74] A. Vistoli, *Notes on Grothendieck Topologies, Fibered Categories and Descent Theory.* In: B. Fantechi *et al.*, *Fundamental Algebraic Geometry: Grothendieck's FGA Explained* (American Mathematical Society, 2005), pp. 1–104. Updated version (2008): `http://homepage.sns.it/vistoli/descent.pdf`

[75] R. M. Wald, *General Relativity* (Chicago University Press, 1984).

[76] R. M. Wald, *On Identically Closed Forms Locally Constructed from a Field.* J. Math. Phys. **31** (1990) 2378–2384.

[77] J.-C. Weise, *Über die algebraische Formulierung der klassischen Allgemeinen Relativitätstheorie.* Diplomarbeit, Universität Hamburg (2011). `http://www.desy.de/uni-th/theses/Dipl_weise.pdf`

[78] H. Weyl, *Geodesic Fields in the Calculus of Variations for Multiple Integrals.* Ann. Math. **36** (1935) 607–629.

[79] A. Zajtz, *Nonlinear Peetre-like Theorems.* Univ. Iagel. Acta Math. **37** (1999) 351–361.

Dipartimento di Matematica, Facoltà di Scienze MFN, Università di Trento – Via Sommarive 14, I-38050 Povo (TN), Italy
E-mail address: `romeo.brunetti@unitn.it`

II. Institut für theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg – Luruper Chaussee 149, D-22761 Hamburg (HH), Germany
E-mail address: `klaus.fredenhagen@desy.de`

II. Institut für theoretische Physik, Universität Hamburg – Luruper Chaussee 149, D-22761 Hamburg (HH), Germany
Current address: Centro de Matemática, Computação e Cognição, Universidade Federal do ABC (UFABC) – Rua Santa Adélia, 166 – 09210-170 Santo André (SP), Brazil
E-mail address: `pedro.ribeiro@ufabc.edu.br`